

THE SECOND PART
OF THE
BOOK OF ZECHARIAH

WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE TIME
OF ITS ORIGIN.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF BASEL

(NOVEMBER 1891)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY

Rev NATHANIEL I. RUBINKAM B. A.
U. S. A.

BASEL.

R. REICH, vorm. C. DETLOFF's Buchhandlung.
1892.

THE SECOND PART
OF THE
BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

THE SECOND PART
OF THE
BOOK OF ZECHARIAH

WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE TIME
OF ITS ORIGIN.

A DISSERTATION
PRESENTED TO THE PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF BASEL

(NOVEMBER 1891)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY

Rev. NATHANIEL I. RUBINKAM B. A.
U. S. A.



BASEL.
R. REICH, vorm. C. DETLOFF's Buchhandlung.
1892.

Printed by
M. WERNER-RIEHL,
Basel.

To the Memory
of
DR. AUGUST THOLUCK

of HALLE,
the great friend of students, who received the author into his home
and friendship in 1875,

and

WITH GRATITUDE
to all whose instructions and kindness have been helpful during the
present visit, naming with special pleasure Prof. Dr. H. L. STRACK of
BERLIN, and Prof. Dr. B. DUHM and Lic. K. MARTI of BASEL.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41548817_0069

CONTENTS.

	Pages
Bibliography	1— 5
I. Historical sketch of the criticism	7—10
II. The question concerning the Zecharianic and pre-exilic authorship preliminarily noticed .	11—19
III. The canonical question affecting the discussion	20—27
IV. Examination of chapter 9, 1-10	28—35
V. » » » 9, 11-17	36—39
VI. » » » 10	40—47
VII. » » » 11	48—58
VIII. » » » 12	59—68
IX. » » » 13, 1-6	69—71
X. » » » 13, 7-9	72—74
XI. » » » 14	75—82
Summary	83—84

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

LITERATURE ON ZECHARIAH SINCE JOSEPH MEDE.

The following list, which I have arranged for reference, though only partial, is too large to admit here of remarks upon single works. Not all of them have been accessible to me. A large number of them I have consulted. Additional literature and sources are mentioned in the footnotes.

Joseph Mede († 1638): *Dissert. eccles. triga. Frag. sacra.* Lond. 1853. Works, 4th edition Lond. 1677. p. 786. — [*Hugo Grotius*: Annotations in V. T. 1644. Ed. Vogel and Doederlein. Hal. 1676 vol. II] — *H. Hammond*: Paraphrase and Annotations etc. 6th ed. Lond. 1653. III pp. 135. 745. — *J. Marckius*: Comm. in duod. proph. min. Amst. 1696-1701. Ed. nova, Tüb. 1734. — *Rich. Kidder*: Demonstration of the Messias, in which the truth of the Christian religion is proved against all enemies thereof, but espec. against the Jews. Lond. 1700. 2nd ed. 1726, p. 76. — *W. Whiston*: Essay toward restoring the true text of the O. T. etc. Lond. 1722, p. 93 f. — *J. G. Eichhorn*: Einleitung etc. eds. 1-3. Leipz. 1783-1803. — *B. G.*

Flügge: Die Weissagungen welche bei den Schriften des Zach. beigebogen sind etc. Hamb. 1784. — *W. Newcome*: An attempt toward an improved version etc. of the twelve min. prophets. Lond. 1785. New ed. 1836. — *J. D. Michaëlis*: Neue orientalische und exeget. Bibliothek I. Gött. 1786. — *G. F. Seiler*: Theol. krit. Betrachtung neuer Schriften. Erlangen 1786. — *G. L. Bauer*: Die kleinen Proph. mit Comm. Leipz. 1786-90. Einleitung etc. Nürnberg. 1794. — *B. G. Flügge*: Beyträge zur orient. u. exeget. Bibliothek etc. Hamb. 1787. — *J. C. Doederlein*: Auserlesene theol. Bibliothek. Leipz. 1787. — *H. Venema*: Comment. ad lib. proph. Zach. Leovard 1784. 1787. — *J. D. Dathe*: Proph. min. lat. versi notisq. phil. et crit. illust. Hal. ed. III. 1790. — *H. Corrodi*: Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Gesch. des jüdischen u. christl. Bibelkanons, I. Hal. 1792. — *J. H. Bechhaus*: Über die Integ. der prophet. Schriften des alten Bundes. Hal. 1796. — *Benj. Blaney*: A new Transl. of the Proph. of Zech. with notes Oxford 1797. — *J. Jahn*: Einleitung etc. II. 2. Wien 1803. — *H. E. G. Paulus*: Die drei ersten Evangelien. Lübeck 1805, Leipz. 1812, Heid. 1832 III (to Matt. 21, 4). — *Ch. W. Augusti*: Einleitung etc. Leipz. 1806-29. *Leonard Bertholdt*: Einleitung etc. Erlangen 1812-19, vol. IV. 1814. — *E. F. K. Rosenmüller*: Scholia in V. T. 7th part. vol. IV. 1816, -28, -38. — *W. M. L. de Wette*: Einleitung etc. Eds. 1-3. Berlin 1817-29. — *F. B. Köster*: Meletemata crit. et exeget. in Zach. proph. part. post. Gött. 1818. — *J. G. Eichhorn*: Übersetz. der hebr. Proph. 1819, Einleitung etc. 4th ed. 1824. — *J. Stonard*: Comm. on Zech. Lond. 1824. — *Ed. Forberg*: Comm. crit. et exeget. in Zach. vatic. part. post. Cob. 1824. — *J. A. Theiner*: Comm. über d. heil. Schrift. Die zwölf kl. Proph. Leipz. 1828. — *Pt. F. Ackermann*: Proph. min. perpet. annot. ill. Vien. 1830. — *W. M. L. de Wette*: Einleitung etc. Eds. 4-7. 1833. — *K. P. W. Gramberg*: Krit. Gesch. der Religionsideen d. A. T. Berlin 1830, II §§ 42. 61. — *Ferd. Hitzig*: Über die Abfassungszeit d. Orak. Zach. 9-14. Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1830. Die zwölf kl. Proph. Leipz. 1838. — *E. W.*

Hengstenberg: Die Authentie des Dan. u. d. Integ. des Sach. 1831. Christolog. des A. T. 1832. 2nd ed. pt. I. vol. 3. 1856. — *J. K. W. Vatke*: Bibl. Theol. etc. I. Berlin 1835 § 27. — *Aug. Knobel*: Der Prophetismus der Hebräer. Breslau 1837. vol. II. — *A. M'Caul*: Rab. Kimchi's Comm. upon the Proph. Zech. trans. etc. Lond. 1837. — *Hesselberg*: Die zwölf kl. Proph. 1838. — *E. Barlee*: An explanatory vers. of the min. Proph. 1839. — *Heinr. Ewald*: Die Proph. des alten Bundes. I. Stuttg. 1840 vol. I. — *F. J. V. D. Maurer*: Comm. gram. hist. crit. in proph. min. Leip. 1840. — *J. D. F. Burger*: Études exég. et crit. sur le Proph. Zach. Strasb. 1841. — *J. G. Herbst und B. Welte*: Einleitung etc. Karlsr. 1842. — *Ed. Meier*: Die Bearbeitung der zwölf kl. Proph. v. Hitzig, Maurer u. Ewald (Zeller's Theol. Jahrbuch 1-3. 1843). — *H. A. Chr. Hävernicks*: Einleitung etc. II. 1844. §§ 263-4. 2nd ed. by Keil, Frankf. a. M. 1854. — *F. W. C. Umbreit*: Pract. Comm. über d. Proph. d. alten Bundes. Hamb. 1844-6. — *E. Henderson*: The Minor Prophets with Comm. etc. Lond. 1845. — *J. J. Stähelin*: Die messian. Weissagungen etc. Berlin 1847. — *F. Bleek*: Über d. Zeitalter v. Sach. Cap. 9-14. Stud. u. Krit. 1852. II. — *C. F. Keil*: Einleitung etc. Frankf. a. M. 1853, p. 357 ff. — *P. Schegg*: Die kleinen Propheten. Regensburg 1854-62. — *M. Baumgarten*: Die Nachtgesichte Sach. Braunschweig 1854-5. — *J. Chr. K. Hofmann*: Weissagung u. Erfüllung. 1841-4. Der Schriftbeweis. Nördl. 1855 II, 2. p. 554 f. 2nd ed. 1860. p. 603. — *T. V. Moore*: The Proph. of the Restoration . . . New trans. with notes. N. Y. 1856. — *Ed. Meier*: Gesch. der poet. Nationallit. der Hebräer. Leipz. 1856. — *H. L. Sandrock*: Prior. et post. Zach. part. vat. ab uno eodem auc. prof. 1856. — *A. Geiger*: Urschrift u. Übersetzung etc. Breslau 1857. — *L. Reinke*: Die messianische Weissagung. Giessen 1859-62. — *E. F. J. von Ortenberg*: Die Bestandtheile des Buches Sacharja. Gotha 1859. — *C. K. J. Bunsen*: Die Propheten. Leipz. 1860. — *W. Neumann*: Die Weissagung des Sakharjah. Stuttg. 1860. — *Sam. Davidson*: Introduction to the

O. T. London 1862-3. — *Th. Kliefoth*: Der Prophet Sach. übersetzt etc. Schwerin 1862. — *J. J. Stähelin*: Specielle Einleitung. Elberf. 1862. — *Fr. Böttcher*: Neue exeget. Aehrenlese etc. Leipz. 1863-4. — *Ab. Kuenen*: Hist. crit. Onderzoek etc. 1863-1885 (German ed. 1892, vol. II). — *J. J. S. Perowne*: Art. Zechariah, in Smith's Bib. Dictionary. Lond. 1863. — *Ralph Wardlaw*: Lectures on the Proph. of Zech. 1869. — *W. Pressel*: Comm. zu Hag., Sach. u. Mal. Gotha 1870. — *A. Elzas*: The Min. Proph. trans. etc. II. Lond. 1873. — *C. Fr. Keil*: Comm. über d. zwölf kl. Proph. Leipz. 1866-8. — *T. W. Chambers*: Zech. (in Lange's Comm. Eng. ed.) 1874. — *B. Duhm*: Die Theologie der Propheten. Bonn 1875. — *L. Diestel*: Art. Sacharja, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex. 1875. — *Wordsworth*: The Minor Proph. in the A. V. etc. Lond. 1875. — *J. Schleier*: Die zwölf kl. Proph. Nördlingen 1876. — *J. B. Lange*: Sach. (im Bibelwerk). Bielefeld u. Leipz. 1876. — *W. Drake*: Zech. (in Speaker's Comm.) Lond. 1876. — *S. R. Bosanquet*: The Prophecies of Zech. 1877. — *E. B. Pusey*: The Minor Prophets. Oxf. and Lond. 1877. — *C. C. H. Wright*: Zech. and his prophecies (Bampton Lectures) 1878. — *Marcus Dodds*: Hag., Zech. and Mal. (in Hdbks. for Bib. Classes). Edinb. 1879. — *C. J. Bredenkamp*: Der Proph. Sach. Erlangen 1879. — *H. Steiner*: 4th ed. of Hitzig's zwölf kleinen Proph. 1881. — *M. Walther*: Le prophète Zacharie. Lausanne 1881. — *B. Stade*: Programm zum Ludwigstage. Giessen 1880. — Deuterozacharja in Z. A. T. W. 1881-2. — *W. H. Lowe*: The Hebr. Students Comm. on Zech. Lond. 1882. — *Ferd. Montet*: Étude crit. sur le date assignable aux six derniers chap. de Zech. Genève 1882. — *Ed. Riehm*: Art. Sach. in Handb. des bibl. Alterth. 1884. Einleitung etc. (posthumously pub.). Hal. 1889. — *C. A. Briggs*: Messianic Prophecy. Edinb. 1886. — *T. T. Perowne*: Hag. and Zech. (in Cambridge Bib. for Schools and Colleges). — *C. von Orelli*: Ezek. u. d. zwölf kl. Propheten. Nördl. 1888. — *T. K. Cheyne*: The Origin of the Book of Zech. (in Jewish Quart. Rev. Oct. 1888). — *F. W.*

Farrar: The Minor Prophets (Men of the Bible series), N. Y.
— *H. Graetz*: The last Chap. of Zech. (in Jewish Quart. Rev.
Lond. Jan. 1891). — *W. Staerk*: Komposition u. Abfassungs-
zeit von Zech. 9-14. (Dissert.) Hal. 1891. — *S. R. Driver*:
Introduction to the Lit. of the O. T. Eds. 1-3, Edinb. 1891-2.
— *K. Marti*: Der Prophet Sach. der Zeitgenosse Serubbabels.
Freib. 1892.

I.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE CRITICISM.

The motive of finding a better explanation than the Fathers had devised, for the quotation in Matt. 27, 9-10 of Zech. 11, 12-13 as from Jeremiah, led Joseph Mede, in England, early in the 17th century, to seek for the chapters Zech. 9-11, a pre-exilic authorship. The way to freedom of criticism being once broken, the whole of the second part of Zechariah viz., chapters 9-14, was by various English writers assigned to a pre-exilic period. This view was introduced into Germany by Benedict Gilbert Flügge in 1784. Impelled by the same motive as Mede, viz., to vindicate the Matthew quotation, he followed Mede's successors in denying to the whole of the second part a post-exilic origin.

Defenders of the unity of the book were not wanting, and so great was the zeal on both sides, from Mede's day, that the succeeding century produced an extensive literature upon the subject. The history of the controversy was written at the beginning of this century by Fried. B. Köster, who defended the post-exilic origin of chaps. 9-14 as well as the unity of

the whole book. Among the writers of this period who contended for the pre-exilic authorship, were Augusti, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller and Hitzig (1830).¹ As the century advanced, new steps were taken on each side of the problem. Eichhorn, who in the earlier editions of his Introduction wavered in his decisions, in the fourth edition took a strong position, not only for the post-exilic, but also for the post-Zecharianic authorship of the second part. Already however, Grotius (1644), Corrodi (1792) and Paulus (1805), had thought on a post-Zecharianic period. Eichhorn's interpretation made little headway against the pre-exilic view, and the post-Zecharianic theory had few adherents, at least publicly, except Gramberg, Vatke and, later, Abraham Geiger. On the other hand, Ewald, followed by Edward Meier and others, assigned chaps. 9-14 to two different pre-exilic authors, viz. chaps. 9-11 to a writer of the time of Ahaz, and chaps. 12-14 to a writer at the beginning of the Exile.

This pre-exilic, double authorship, defended by Bleek and Hitzig (1852), became the prevailing opinion. One of the most enthusiastic exponents of this view was Emil F. J. v. Ortenberg, who considered it to be established with "absolute certainty", and calls it the "heavenly truth" and the "precious pearl". v. Ortenberg argued that chaps. 9-11 and 13, 7-9 were written by the Zechariah mentioned in Isaiah 8, 2 about the year 720 B. C. and chaps. 12—13, 6 and 14 between the year of Josiah's death, 609, and the

¹ See the Literature, page 1 ff. In this historical sketch, simply enough names will be mentioned to indicate the progress of the criticism.

destruction of Jerusalem, 586. This view of the pre-exilic origin of chaps. 9-14, with various modifications, has prevailed in the great majority of commentaries, Introductions and works on Prophecy, in Germany, in the past quarter of a century. Diestel in 1875 repeats the statement of Bleek in 1852 that this is one of the "surest results of the modern investigations of the Bible." In England this view has had its adherents, among others, in Dr. Samuel Davidson, A. P. Stanley, and F. W. Farrar. In America C. A. Briggs agrees with the view so far as chaps. 9-12 are concerned, but assigns chaps. 12-14 to a post-exilic writer other than Zechariah.

That the position of the unity of the Book and the Zecharianic authorship of the whole book, is not so easily yielded, is seen in the long list of defenders, among whom are De Wette, in the Editions 4-7 of his Introduction, Keil, Köhler and Hengstenberg on the Continent, Henderson, Pusey and C. H. H. Wright in England, and T. W. Chambers, in the American Edition of Lange's Commentaries. The arguments of the defenders of the traditional view have been mainly directed against the position of the pre-exilic origin of Part II. and little attention has been given to the refutation of the post-Zecharianic authorship. The criticism of the last quarter of the century is, however, showing a decided tendency to seek in this latter view, in some of its forms, a more satisfactory solution of the problem than has hitherto been attained. Stade, in the first two volumes of the *Zeitschrift für die alt-test. Wissenschaft* (1881-2) re-opened and discussed the question at length and concluded that chaps. 9-14

were written in the period of the contests of the Diadochi viz., between 333-278 B. C. and probably by a single hand.¹ Prof. Cheyne in the Jewish Quarterly Review (October 1888) decides that these chapters were written by one who "lived nearer to that apocalyptic age of which the most noted representative is the author, if we should not say authors, of Daniel." The late venerable Franz Delitzsch, in his »*Messianische Weissagung*«, published at Leipsic eight days before his death, gives substantially the same opinion, when on page 149 he says: »*In der That ist der Charakter dieses zweiten Teils des B. Sacharja von dem des ersten sachlich und sprachlich so verschieden, dass sich zureichende Gründe für Einheit des Verfassers nicht erbringen lassen. Aber um so gewisser ist es, dass der Verfasser, wenn auch nicht Sacharja Sohn Berechjas ist, doch kein vor-exilischer Prophet sein kann; Die zwei נחמ aus denen dieser zweite Teil besteht (C. 9-11, 12-14) sind durchaus gleichartig, gleichen apokalyptischen Charakters wie Jes. C. 24-27.*« These four Isaiah chapters he elsewhere sets after Deutero-Isaiah (40-66), but declares that the time of their origin cannot be determined. Zech. 9-14 he leaves equally undetermined, including them in the Restoration Period which, in his analysis, stretches from Cyrus, 537 B. C. to the composition of the Book of Daniel, 168 B. C.

¹ See, however, footnote 3 p. 38.

II.

THE QUESTION OF THE ZECHARIANIC AND PRE-EXILIC AUTHORSHIP PRELIMINARILY NOTICED.

With these two and a half centuries of criticism before us, it becomes us to enter upon this subject with reverence and caution. It is becoming evident that in spite of the great number of scholars who, in the past four or five decades, have declared for the pre-exilic origin of the chapters under consideration, this theory is ceasing to satisfy. Not only those who for the first time are publishing their opinions upon the subject, but also those who have formerly advocated the pre-exilic authorship, are declaring for a post-exilic date.

Others take refuge in the view, that while the prophecy was originally pre-exilic, it has been worked over by a prophet after the Exile in order to adapt it to a later situation. To my mind, however, there are no elements in the chapters which hinder their production in the post-exilic period. The weight of evidence seems to me also to decide for a post-Zecharianic period. With the exception of chapter 9, 1-10, which has the background of the situation at the time of the approach of Alexander the Great into the

East, the whole of the second part can best be explained as a witness to the struggles of Judaism, for existence amid the Græco-Syriac persecutions, and for the development of the Theocracy under the Hasmonean leadership.¹ Having thus provisionally stated our position, we will first measure it, in general terms, with other claims, and then seek in a more detailed study of the chapters, its more specific justification.

There are three helps in judging of the historic origin of a prophetic² writing, 1st the hints we may receive from language — the diction and style — enabling us to identify the personality or the period of the writer, 2^{dly} its apparent historic allusions, or its general coloring, revealing internal, national con-

¹ See p. 38.

² It is not necessary to abandon the term prophet, in designating the author of Zech. 9-14 as some critics have done, no matter how late the chapters may be set. Though the age of classic prophecy had passed, the term »prophet« was employed by Jews, even into the Christian period, to designate those who interpreted God's will to the people, or who had messages, true or false, which claimed divine authority. Comp. Matt. 7, 15, 10, 41, 11, 9, 13, 57, 14, 5, 21, 26. 46. chap. 23. Luke 2, 36, 7, 39 etc. The remark of the Talmud (Baba bathra. Fol. 12-a) is instructive here: »From the day on which the sanctuary was destroyed prophecy ceased from the prophets and was given to the wise men. But is not a wise man a prophet? Certainly it is to be so understood. Although revelation was drawn from the prophets it was not taken from the wise. Amemar added: The wise man is to be preferred to the prophet, for it is said (Ps. 90) The prophet, whose heart is full of wisdom.«

ditions, 3^{dly} the prophetic or teaching purpose, i. e. the work it may seem to have in view, as an utterance for the times, indicating its place in the development of prophetic literature.

In applying the criteria of language, I would not argue a different authorship for Part II from that of Part I on the ground that here is prose and there poetry, here simplicity and clearness and there obscurity, or even that each has expressions and phrases peculiar to itself. Such stylistic differences as these may be defended as possible without the resort to a twofold authorship.

There is, however, a feature of Zech. 1-8 which we may fairly expect in any collection of writings from the same hand, and the absence of which in Part II strengthens us in the conviction, which we have on other grounds, that chapters 9-14 have a different origin, viz., the feature of external and internal unity. The unity of chapters 1-8 is of such a character as to argue against the unity of the whole book. The introduction gives the date of the prophecy, the name of the Persian king, the name of the prophet and the motive of his mission, in most explicit terms. The series of eight visions which follows is precisely dated, even to the day of the month. Unity, external as well as internal, is one of the striking features of these visions. The passage which follows, on the symbolical crowning of the high priest, contains the same motive of encouragement in the rebuilding of the temple. The closing piece, chapters 7 and 8, on fasting is precisely dated and is set amid the scenes

of the Restoration, closing with promise and warning, touching at every point the national situation at this period. Thus closes Part I. Whatever may be the difficulties in the details of exegesis, we have the irresistible impression of its unity, of the prominence of one general motive, of a close co-ordination of the language with the national situation and the characteristic precision of the author. A similar feature we have some reason to expect in any work produced by the same hand. But when we turn to Part II (chapters 9-14) we are struck with the entire absence of this trait. There are no dates to fix the historic place of the chapters and no name to identify their author.¹ What is most characteristically present in chapters 1-8 as a whole, is most characteristically absent from chapters 9-14 as a whole. This would be at least a very remarkable phenomenon on the hypothesis that the same hand had any part in the arranging of the whole book.² It would only seem

¹ Since writing the above, I notice that Samuel Sharpe in his *History of the Hebrew Nation and Literature*, London 1882, assigns chapters 9-14 to five different periods: 9, 1-10 and 10 to the reign of Hezekiah; 9, 11-17 to the struggle against the Greeks of Syria; 11 to the reign of Menahem; 12 and 13 after the death of Josiah; 14 to the reign of Darius. The separate passages and chapters possess in themselves a unity, and the word »Verworrenheit« used by Giesebrecht, at the end of his »Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik«, to characterize chapters 9-14, seems to me to be hardly appropriate. But their lack of external unity and clear co-ordination with the national situation of the Restoration period has made it possible for scholars to scatter them over a period of 600 years, from Ahaz to Aristobulus.

² This consideration makes the theory that Zech. in-

possible on the supposition that a later collector had expunged the names and dates which might make the identity of the pieces unmistakable.

We leave the argument from language, and ask if there are historic allusions, or a manifest prophetic purpose in chapters 9-14 by which we may identify them with the Zecharianic period? It is confessedly difficult to find in the period of the rebuilding of the temple an attachment or starting point for the contents of Part II. Those who argue for the Zecharianic authorship tell us, as George Earnest Hoffmann,¹ that they are »*eschatologische Träume*« or that they are predictions of a distant future — of the age of Alexander, of Antiochus, of the destruction of Jerusalem, of the Christian Church. To find in them an attachment to the facts and conditions present before the eyes of the nation at the time in which they were written, or spoken, is not considered important. Henderson, in his introduction to chap. 11 says: "As the predictions do not relate to the times in which those persons lived, it is not conceivable how they could have so appropriated them as to derive effectual advantage from them. Besides, they contain no instances of direct address, or personal application of the truths delivered, such as we find in the other prophets when addressing themselves to contemporaries, for their immediate benefit. It may therefore be concluded, that they were communicated to Zechariah on some oc-

corporated the chaps. 9-14 into his book from earlier prophecies very difficult.

¹ Hiob p. 34 footnote.

casion or occasions of which we have no knowledge. The scenes depicted lay in a more distant future."

If it be true that this chapter and others have no historical allusion to the Zecharianic age, and no lesson for it, we have here sufficient ground to lead us to seek another period or periods for their origin, for we hold fast to the principle that the prophetic writer speaks to the age in which he lives, is its interpreter, and the representative of its instructive elements. Whatever he may say concerning the future, of warning, comfort or promise, is interwoven with the immediate situation, is the dark shadow cast forward by the nation's sins, or the bright light dawning to its hopes. Whatever may be the later application of Old Testament writings, the fact that the writer spoke to his age, in terms appropriate to his age, is the only key which enables us to enter upon the scientific study of these writings.

If these chapters do not belong to the age of Zechariah, why do we not follow the prevailing criticism and seek for them a pre-exilic origin? Preliminarily, it will be sufficient if we show that such a course is not necessary. The attachment of a body of pre-exilic writings solidly to a post-exilic book is so opposed to analogy, that the proofs for its necessity should be unmistakably strong. We find nothing in these chapters which makes the refuge to a pre-exilic theory necessary. These chapters contain terms appropriate to pre-exilic conditions, but we must bear in

mind that the later a book is, the less is the value of the argument from the use of words, and forms of speech. While an earlier writer cannot use phrases which have their birth in a later age, the later writer may be greatly influenced by the diction and style of the earlier age. Forms of speech, like modes of dress changed very slowly, and the later generations, used expressions which could no longer be literally applied, but which were thoroughly understood. Thus, in the chapters we are considering, the terms Ephraim (chap. 10), Judah and Ephraim (chap. 9), Judah and Israel (chap. 12), Beth David (chaps. 12 & 13) Egypt and Assyria, the teraphim etc., which have the ring of pre-exilic productions, and thus have led criticism to seek in them the political and religious situation of a former period,¹ can all be explained on the principle we have stated.² We must not overlook

¹ Compare even so recent an Article as that of Prof. Graetz in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* Jan. 1891 (p. 212). »Those chapters which assume the continuation of the House of David and the prevalence of idolatry, certainly belong to the period before the exile, while the last chapter belongs to the period after it.« Also Prof. Driver in his *Introduction* just issued (p. 327). »... passages such as 9, 10 ('I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem') 11, 14 (where the 'brotherhood' between Judah and Israel, existing at the time, is broken) especially the latter, are very difficult of explanation if the prophecy be of post-exilic date.«

² Some of the expressions supposed to be pre-exilic are used even by New Test. writers. Also compare the New Test. expression which speaks of Jesus coming »... into the borders of Zebulon and Naphthali« Matt. 4, 13.

Numberless illustrations occur to us of the tenacity of technical terms to retain their place in popular speech and in

the powerful influence of the earlier prophets on the diction and style of post-exilic writers. The later writers, especially in the national struggles of the Grecian period, were so possessed with every word and line of the classic prophets and the other sacred writers, whose utterances were their only literature and exclusive interest, that their own productions were replete with archaic terms.¹

These considerations, I believe, are sufficient to explain all the terms which we find in chaps. 9-14, appropriate to an earlier period, without resort to theory of a pre-exilic authorship of these chapters. These terms are referred to again where we consider the contents of the chapters. The argument from words is one where the greatest caution is necessary. It was, as we have seen (page 8), a single linguistic hint, even the use of a single word in St. Matthew's Gospel, which formed the basis of this pre-exilic

literature after they have lost their literal application. Recently I noticed in a presentation address in America that the speaker used the term »shillings and pence« in presenting a purse of American money. Later critics might conclude that that address must have been written in our colonial period, when we still used English money. Their error would be in giving too much weight to the argument from language and too little to other criteria.

¹ We do not need therefore to deprive deutero-Zechariah of all originality and consider him as mechanically copying and combining ideas from the earlier prophets. See Stade in Pt. II. of his article referred to above, where he discusses the relation of deutero-Zechariah to earlier Old Test. Prophecy. Compare Zech. 9, 2^b-4 with Amos 1, 9-10; Zech. 9, 6^b-7 with Amos 1, 7-8; Zech. 11, 1-3 with Jer. 25, 34-38; Zech. 14, 16 with Is. 66, 23 etc.

theory, and then the finding of terms and expressions in chapters 9-14 suited to earlier conditions enlarged and expanded this structure for two and a half centuries. If, therefore, in our consideration of the separate chapters, it can be shown that the historic background and the prophetic motive of these chapters belong to a post-exilic date, and that all of their terms are explicable, in the later situation, there will be no need of an endeavor to refute the pre-exilic arguments in detail.

III.

THE CANONICAL QUESTION AFFECTING THE DISCUSSION.

In the history of this criticism, every attempt to find a later origin of chapters 9-14 has encountered the objection of a closed Canon. The full discussion of the question concerning the Canon does not belong here, but not being willing to proceed further until I had satisfied this objection in my own mind, I will give here simply an outline of the canonical argument which affects the present discussion.¹

1. In the earliest notices which we have, looking toward an Old Testament Canon, we see a constant striving toward the collection of a body of writings with divine authority, but there is no word from which we may infer a collection complete and unalterable.

a) In the later Old Test. Books — as Zechariah, Malachi, Ezra and Daniel, we find not only the divine authority of the first division — the

¹ To the long list of works on the Old Test. Canon have been added the present year (1891) Buhl: *Kanon und Text des Alt. Test.* Leipzig; Wildeboer: *Die Entstehung des Alt. Test. Kanons* (translated into German from the Dutch). Gotha.

Thorah — pressed upon the people, but also an appeal made to the “former prophets” and “the prophets”, showing the inception and growth of a second division, viz., of prophetical books, but of course with no hint as yet of a completed Canon.

- b) The second witness we have is in the apocryphal book 2 Maccabees 2, 13, where there is related the Jewish tradition that the prophet Jeremiah found, on the mountain where Moses had his vision of Canaan, a hollow cave, and deposited there the tabernacle, the ark and the altar of incense etc.

Vs. 13 reads: “The same things also were reported in the memoirs (ὑπομνηματισμοῖς) of Nehemiah; and how he, founding a library, (βιβλιοθήκην) gathered together the acts of the kings and the prophets and of David and the letters of the kings concerning the votive offerings (ἀναθημάτων).” This passage, we see, is so embedded in fable that its testimony is injured. Nevertheless it is witness to a record current in the second century B. C. of the activity of Nehemiah, in his day, in the collection of the sacred writings. But we certainly have no sufficient grounds here for inferring a completed Canon in Nehemiah’s time. On the contrary, the verse which follows says that Judas (Maccabeus) added to Nehemiah’s collection, (vs. 14). “In like manner Judas collected all (the writings) that were scattered

by reason of the war we had, and they are with us.”¹

- c) A more important witness is the prologue to the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, by a grandson of the same name who went to Egypt in the 38th year of the reign of Evergetes II (Ptolemy VII). This king reigned 170-116 B. C., so that the Prologue was written probably about 132 B. C.² The writer says that his grandfather, whose work he was translating from Hebrew into Greek, was much given “to the reading of the law and the prophets and the other books of the fathers (καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρῶν βιβλίων).” If there had existed at that time an opinion that the number and extent of the sacred writings were fixed and unalterable, he would most probably have given some hint of it, especially in connection with the clause which follows the one quoted, in which he says of his grandfather, that “he was drawn on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom.” Or we might expect some such statement by the author of the prologue to

¹ The letter in which this passage occurs is dated 188 of the Seleuciden era, (125 B.C.). The dispute about this date does not affect the present question.

What this Maccabean collection was, whether of writings of an earlier date, or of writings which witnessed to the struggles of the Maccabean period itself, we have no means of knowing.

² See Schürer II. 595.

this prologue¹ in connection with the remark concerning the grandson that he lived “almost after all the prophets”, or, in connection with the statement concerning the grandfather, that “he did imitate Solomon, and was no less famous for wisdom and learning, both being indeed a man of great learning and so reputed also.” But we search in vain in these prologues for a statement from which we can conclude that they witness to a closed Canon. The above quotations rather reveal a claim, in the mind of the writers, of the worthiness of the Wisdom of Sirach itself to a place among the sacred writings.

2. The Septuagint, Greek, translation, made, according to tradition, under Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, (287-247 B. C.) included only the first division — the Thorah. The translation of the second and third divisions — the Nebîm and the Kethubîm — was gradual and by private hands and hence yields no data for determining the time of the closing of the Canon.²

¹ See the English edition of the Apocrypha, published by Bagster.

² Prideaux (II. 285-8) argued that the LXX translation of the Prophets was made by the Egyptian Jews who were adherents to the temple built by Onias IV. On order to justify this temple they changed the text of Is. 19, 18 where the prophecy was that the name of the city where this temple should be built should be called עִיר הַהָרָס »city of destruction«, (or according to other Heb. texts עִיר הַחֶרֶס »city of the sun«) to πόλις ἀσεδεί »city of righteousness«. As this however is

3. In regard to the third division — the Kethubîm — the discussion as to the canonicity of certain books, and the enlargement and modification of others, e. g. the Psalms, seems to have been a contemporaneous process¹ until the first century B. C. when the enlargement process ceased and the discussion of certain portions, such as Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, extended into the first century A. D.

4. As to the second division — the Nebîim — including the prophetic-historical and prophetical books, although it began early to take form, and in the post-exilic period gradually attained general recognition as of divine authority, we cannot fairly

only a Grecising of a Hebrew term עֵיר הַזֶּדֶק, this latter was probably the Hebrew text which the translators had. This makes plausible the view that this latter was the original text, and the words of our present Heb. texts, the later. Also that the passage Is. 19, 18-25 is a later addition to verses 1-17. Comp. Hitzig: *Der Prophet Jesaja* p. 233. Geiger: *Urschrift*, p. 79.

¹ See »The Old Documents and the New Bible« by J. Paterson Smyth, Bagsters, London 1890. On p. 71 the author says that the LXX, begun about 280 B. C., is »a most valuable witness to the fact that our Hebrew Bible of to-day is substantially the same book that was in use three hundred years before Christ.« On the following page he speaks of the LXX as witnessing substantially to »the whole Old Testament« in the 3rd cent. On page 74 he quotes Psalm 97 as probably written 168 B. C. — the Maccabean period. Those writers who place the closing of the Canon at a still earlier date are sure to use some such modifying clause as »in all essential respects«, which really means that the Canon was still in process of formation. Comp. E. C. Bissel: *Historic Origin of the Bible*. p. 288.

conclude that it was unalterably closed earlier than the third division.

- a) The fact that certain passages, as, e. g., 1 Sam. 17, 12-31. 55-58. 18, 1-5 are omitted by the LXX, may be explained in different ways. 1) They may have been added after the LXX translation, or 2) they might have been in some copies, but not in the one used by the Seventy, or 3) they might have been rejected by the LXX. Whichever reason we give, it shows that still in the Greek period there was a liberty taken with the material, which could not be taken after the Canon was closed.
- b) From the fact that the book of Daniel is among the Kethubîm in the Hebrew Canon, we may conclude that there was such a consensus of opinion at the time it was written, (according to tradition, in the sixth century, according to more recent opinion, in the second century), as to exclude from the prophetical books at least a whole new book. We cannot infer more, and even here there is the reserve that other reasons may have existed for putting it among the Kethubîm.
- c) The discussion as to the canonicity of Ezek. 40-48 extended into the Christian era. It was claimed that these chapters were irreconcilable with the laws of the Pentateuch and they were allowed to remain, in the belief that when Elias came he would explain all things.

5. The testimony of Josephus¹ and of the New Test. quotations and references is valuable as to the body of Jewish scriptures generally accepted in the first century. Although it is not certain precisely, which books Josephus included under the "twenty-two books" which he arranges to agree with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, it can be inferred that, with perhaps one or two minor exceptions, they agreed substantially with our Hebrew Bible. We are at present concerned only with what he says concerning the pre-Christian Canon. Here the greatest caution is necessary as to his testimony. What he says is in dispute with his Greek opponent in regard to the relative antiquity of the Jewish and Greek writings. Of the Hebrew writings he says: "During so many ages as have already passed [since Artaxerxes] no one hath been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them etc." Here the extravagance of controversy is so apparent that the value of the testimony at this point, is dissipated. What he says would prove too much. Of the Greek literature he says: "Almost all which concerns the Greeks happened not long ago; nay, one may say, is of yesterday only." His opponent could with equal justice have reversed the statement.

Not to pursue the argument further, when we sum up all the positive results of historical inquiry into the Canon of the Old Testament, we are compelled to admit the truth of Steiner's statement at

¹ Against Apion Book 1. Sec. 8.

the opening of his article on the Canon in *Schenkel's Bibel-Lexikon*. »Über die Entstehung des alt-test. Kanons, d. h. über die Zeit, in welcher die Sammlung der betreffenden Bücher begonnen wurde, über die Personen, welche dabei betheiligt waren, und über die Art ihrer Thätigkeit besitzen wir keine genauen directen Nachrichten, und ebensowenig über den Schluss der Sammlung.« If, however, we should formulate a judgment concerning the Old Test. Canon, we would say that it was provisionally and practically closed at the beginning of the first century B. C., although the claims of some portions continued to be disputed in the first century of our era. Our enquiry has convinced us that there is no valid canonical objection to the periods in which we have placed the origin of Zech. 9-14.¹

¹ The inquiry into the historic position of a prophetic writing does not therefore involve a doctrinal problem. I cannot resist quoting with peculiar commendation the admirable words of Perowne in his Introduction to Zechariah in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. »In dealing with this and similar Biblical questions it is important clearly to understand that they are purely critical in their character and must be discussed and decided on the ground of scholarship alone . . . It is unworthy of a scholar and alien from the calm, candid spirit of a seeker after truth, to taunt an opponent with the nome of 'orthodox' or 'rationalist' instead of weighing his reasons, and accepting or rejecting the arguments which he adduces.«

IV.

CHAPTER IX. 1-10.

The מִשָּׁא at the head of chapter 9 cannot well be considered as in status constructus to "דְּבַר־יְהוָה" and the phrase rendered, as it frequently is, "The oracle of the word etc,"¹ which would be equivalent to "the word of the word". מִשָּׁא is evidently an independent superscription, to be read "Oracle: The word of Jahwe".²

When one observes the recurrence of מִשָּׁא at Chap. 12, 1 and at Mal. 1,1. the conclusion is natural that it was placed there to mark a division of this last section of prophetical writings into three parts. This division was evidently only intended to be an external one. Each part at present contains three chapters.³ Stade considers the superscription of Chap. 12, 1 to be an interpolated copy of 9, 1 and that 12, 1 began originally at "נֵאֻם", also that the

¹ So Wright and others. Zunz's Bibel: »Vortrag des Wortes.« A. E. V. »The burden of the Word«.

² So Segond: »Oracle, parole de l'Eternel.« v. Orelli and others: »Orakel, Wort Jahwes.«

³ Since writing the above I notice that Driver accepts as

superscription at 9, 1 belonged to the whole six chapter 9-14.¹ The **יהוה רבר** of 9, 1, according to our analysis, were originally simply the opening words of the short section vs. 1-10. This passage, according to our proposition in the Introduction, (p. 11) was written at the time that the army of Alexander the Great was standing before Tyre. Eichhorn, who in the last edition of his *Einleitung in das A. T.* argued so positively for the conquests of Alexander as the historic background of this passage as to declare (IV. p. 449.) that any other explanation is impossible, considered the whole of chapters 9 and 10 a unit.² Other scholars (e. g. Sharpe in his work above quoted p. 195.) who have not properly assigned the passage, have, however, observed the break in the chapter at verse 11.

We will first look into the contents of these verses 1-10. The writer describes a movement of Jahwe.³

plausible the conjecture that the compiler added the three anonymous pieces 9-11, 12-14 and Mal. 1-3 to his collection which ended at chap. 8, arranging the titles of the second and third pieces on the model of the first.

¹ He suggests that the **יהוה** at the beginning of the oracle has fallen out, and that the original reading was: »Oracle: the word of Jahwe. Jahwe dwells in, etc.«

² Paulus (III p. 120f.) also considered this chapter to be a unit, adding to it 10, 1. but set the whole in the late Macabean period viz. under Hyrcan I.

³ In vs. 1 it is the activity of Jahwe's word, (with prep. **ב** comp. Is. 9, 7), in vs. 4 the subject is Adonai, in vs. 7. the person of Jahwe **והכרתי**. In Hebrew literature the word of Jahwe came more and more to mean the power and even the person, of Jahwe. The Targum of Gen. 3, 8 translates **יהוה את-קול די** with **ית קל מימרא די** »The voice of the word of Jahwe.«

It begins with Syria. It falls upon Hadrach, rests upon Damascus, touches Hamath. It proceeds to Phœnicia. Here the wisdom of Tyre and Sidon is outwitted.¹ Adonai shall dispossess Tyre of her riches, smite in the sea her power which has withstood the sieges of centuries, and burn her with fire. The writer predicts also the effect of this movement upon Philistia: the evacuation of Askelon, the despair of Ekron, the disappearance of the king from Gaza, the breaking of the pride of the Philistines.² The writer then meditates upon the bastard race,³ the half Jewish, half Philistine population of Ashdod, which had disgraced Judaism since the days of Nehemiah (Neh. 13). The prophet foresees the rejudaizing of this people of mixed blood (vs. 7). It shall be freed from the guilt of having eaten blood and forbidden meats (Gen. 9. Ezek. 8. Is. 65.), and shall be restored to Judaism, though perhaps to a place subordinate to that of the genuine Jew.⁴

¹ Segond translates כִּי of 2^b with *malgré*: »in spite of all their wisdom«.

² 6^b is parenthetical, or it may be a marginal remark made after vs. 5, summing up the contents of vs. 5, viz. that the pride of the Philistines should be broken, and in being copied into the text it was put in after 6^a instead of before it. The suffixes in פִּי and in שְׁנֵי certainly refer to the *mamsr.*

³ מִמֶּזֶךְ has been variously interpreted. LXX ἁλλογενεῖς; Vulgate: Separator; Luther: Fremde; Zunz's Bibel: Ausländer; Segond: l'étranger; v. Orelli, A. E. V. and others: Bastard (as Dt. 23, 3); R. E. V. (margin), a bastard race. This is the most explicable rendering.

⁴ The אֶלֶף is best understood as defined by Siegfried and Stade's Wörterbuch, Clanhaupt, head of a clan, subordi-

The most appropriate period in post-exilic, Jewish history for the production of these verses, seems to me to be the moment of the approach of Alexander, when new hope was awakened by his defeat of the Persians at Issus in 333 B. C. and his attack upon Phoenicia. The victory at Issus decided Alexander's empire over Syria. Damascus, which was at the time the store-house of the treasures of Darius, and the rendezvous of his court, was the special prey of the conqueror (See Prideaux I. p. 536). Alexander personally conducted the campaign against Phoenicia where, Sidon quickly succumbing, he began a seven months siege of Tyre. As in connection with the former sieges of Tyre by Salmaneser and Nebuchadnezzar, other prophets had awaited its downfall (Is. 23; Jer. 25, 22. 47, 4; Ezek. 27-28), so here the writer expects the fortress in the sea, which had survived former sieges, to be smitten, and the city to be entirely destroyed. That which is before the eyes of the people as the movement of a great conqueror, is described as a judgment of Jahwe, even his own direct action. The relation of the Jews to this movement, and the whole politico-religious situation, needed to be interpreted so as to allay fear. This view is strengthened by the contents of verse 8 :

»And I will encamp about mine house against an army,
»Against the going over and returning,
»And there shall no more pass over it an oppressor.
»For now I have seen with mine eyes.«

nate prince, as it then gives the best parallel to the following clause, »and Ekron as the Jebusite« i. e. adopted as Israelites but still inferior to those of unpolluted blood.

The long period of rest under the Persian Kings since Cyrus, had been broken by Artaxerxes III (Ochus) 358-338. This monarch, whose brutality at home was unprecedented, exercised the same cruelty toward his western subjects, and the new territory which he sought to subdue. In his own personally conducted expedition against Phoenicia and Egypt, he passed through Judea, took Jericho, carried away captive many Jews, taking some of them with him into Egypt, and on his return (340 B. C.) transporting others to Hyrcania on the shores of the Caspian sea, and possibly others to Babylon.¹

Almost directly upon these events came the news of the approach of Alexander. The downfall of the Persian kingdom was a fact before the minds of the Jews. They were changing the yoke of the Persian for — they knew not what. Bewildered by the brilliant power of the great conqueror they were ready for the assurance of verse 8, that Jahwe would encamp about his house, to protect it against the going and returning of trampling armies.² If נָגִשׁ (vs. 8), oppressor, (LXX. ἐξέλαύνων; Vulg: exactor), has a special rather than a general allusion, it could not have a

¹ Compare Schürer II, p. 496 with Prideaux I, p. 524. Graetz, in the Jewish Quarterly Review (Jan. 1891), in reviewing the historical sources of this expedition of Ochus, suggests it as the back ground of chap. 14. That chapter, as we shall see, is to be otherwise explained, and the expedition of Ochus has an allusion here.

² מַצֵּבָה. The majority of translations follow the Qerê מַצֵּבָה from מִן־צָבָא »against an army«. R. E. V. »against the army«; Zunz's Bibel: wider Schaaren; Köhler: wider Heeresmacht; Segond: pour la défendre contre une armée; Vulgate:

better application than to Ochus, who was pre-eminently an oppressor and whose "going over and returning" was, as we have seen, still in bitter remembrance.¹ The 'כ' of vs. 8, and that of verse 1, give the confirmation that, in all of these movements, Jahwe's eye is especially upon Israel.²

This short oracle ends with the messianic passage (vss. 9-10) in poetic form, composed of two six-line strophes:

»Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion,
 »Shout, daughter of Jerusalem,
 »See! thy king cometh unto thee.
 »Righteous and charged with deliverance³ is he.
 »Humble and riding upon an ass,
 »And upon a colt the foal of an ass.«

Ex his qui militant mihi; The LXX read מִצְבָּה ἀνάστημα a setting up, a station, a garrison. (1 Sam. 14, 12. Ezek. 26, 11). So Siegfried and Stade's Wörterbuch: Schutzwache. v. Orelli: zur Wache etc. Ewald however reads מִצְבָּה = Wall.

¹ The view that this verse merely expresses the idea, developed greatly in later Judaism, that Jahwe would be a wall about his people to keep them from contact and hence pollution with the heathen does not seem to me to meet all the requirements of the text, which certainly has a military allusion.

² Whatever difficulty there may be with the masoretic text of 1^b, it seems to me to be more satisfactory than any of the changes proposed which substitute אֲרָם, Syria, for אָדָם. »Mankind«, i. e. the nations, forms a better antithesis to Israel (Jer. 32, 20) than »Syria«. Israel was scattered among the nations and thus Jahwe had his eye upon the nations for Israel's sake. The R. E. V. has »The eye of man and of all the tribes of Israel is toward the Lord.« Others since Paulus, read »Edom« instead of »Man«.

³ נוֹשֵׁעַ is difficult to translate. This niphal participle

»And he¹ shall cut off chariots from Ephraim,
 »And horses from Jerusalem,
 »The battle bow shall also be cut off,
 »And he shall speak peace to the nations.
 »He shall also reign from sea to sea,
 »And from the river unto the ends of the earth.«

This picture of the king of peace, drawn in the spirit and reminiscence of the messianic expectations of the classic prophets, could well have been suggested in contrast to the picture which was before the eyes of the people, viz: of a prince who was gaining dominion over the earth through military prowess and display. War implements, horses, chariots, against which the classic prophets had disclaimed, (Is. 4. 7. Mic. 7. 10) would be unknown in the messianic kingdom. שָׁלוֹם would be his word to the nations. The symbol of his reign would be his riding upon the domestic beast, the ass.

The whole colouring of this piece (9, 1-10), so far as we can judge from its apparent motives and language, makes it an appropriate production for the end of the Persian period, at the moment of the approach of Alexander the Great. Dean Stanley who, under the influence of the criticism of his day, assigned Zech. 9-14 to a pre-exilic age, says, (in his History

can hardly bear the active sense, as LXX σωζουσ; Vulgate: Salvator; Luther: ein Helfer; Zunz's Bibel: siegreich; Segond: victorieux. The passive sense, as the R. E. V. (margin), »saved«, seems too strong on the other side. Köhlers translation is perhaps the best: »heilbegabt«, gifted with healing, or, as we have translated »charged with deliverance«. v. Orelli: heilvoll.

¹ LXX rightly read והכרית for והכרת.

of the Jewish Church, Lecture XLVII): "In the prophets of the captivity we felt the electric shock produced by the conquests of Cyrus. There is unfortunately no contemporary prophet in whom we can, in like manner, appreciate the approach of Alexander." If, however, we have rightly studied this passage (9, 1-10) this misfortune has been healed.

V.

CHAPTER IX. 11-17.

When we endeavor to find in vss. 11 and 12 a continuation of the poem contained in vss. 9-10, as some have done, we are met with great difficulties. We can produce six lines by rejecting **אין מים בו** of vs. 11.

- »And thou also, through the blood of thy covenant,
- »I have sent thy prisoners from the pit,
[in which there is no water]
- »Return to the strong hold,
- »Prisoners of hope.
- »Also this day he declares:¹
- »Double will I requite thee.«

There is, however, not the poetic form in these lines that exists in the poem of verses 9-10. Also

¹ It is best to explain this much discussed word **מְגִיד** as an aramaism i. e. the participle being used for the perfect tense, as is so frequently the case in the later books of the Old Test.

Hoffmann: Hiob, Kiel 1891 p. 33 reads **מְגִיד** and makes vs. 12 the motto of Job. 42, 10. The LXX (*καὶ ἀντι μίας ἡμέρας παροικεσίας σου*, »for one day of thy sojourning.«) had a different text.

they form no climax to the previous verses, but are like a new beginning after the climax of vs. 10. Verse 11 has a kind of connection both with the foregoing and with the following, and yet we have a feeling that the connection is not essential. If "thou" refers to the preceding, the "daughter of Zion", the "also" seems to apply to some new period or situation. I have the impression that verse 11 is a connecting verse between pieces which belong to far different periods. When I read vss. 11-17 there is the impression of a different historic environment from that observed in vss. 1-10. In vss. 1-10 Jahwe is subduing the nations about Israel which, amid the noise of war and the trampling of armies, is assured of Jahwe's protection. The messianic hope is of a king of peace. There is no hint of danger from the side of Greece. If our interpretation is correct, the approach of the Greek conqueror awakens the hope of protection, at least of peace, and of the enlargement of Jewish state (vs. 7). In vss. 12-17 the Jews are at war with Greece.¹ Jahwe is making Judah into a bow and Ephraim into arrows. Zion is as the sword of a hero. In the heat of the contest Jahwe appears above the host, with arrow of lightning, blowing upon the trumpet, striding in the stormwind. With Jahwe as a shield over them they are devouring,²

¹ The LXX reads »Thy sons O Zion against the sons of Greece« i. e. בְּנֵי יוֹן instead of »בְּנֵי יוֹן. The repetition of בְּנֵי is evidently an ordinary mistake of the copyist.

² The order of words in the masoretic text is very difficult »They shall eat and tread down slingstones.« What would be here the object of וְאָכְלוּ? Probably the enemy

and treading down the slingstones, drinking and shouting as with wine,¹ filled (i. e. bespattered with the blood of their enemies, the Greeks) as the bowl and the corners of the altar.² This utterance is introduced with a call to the prisoners, for whom there was still hope, to return to the stronghold, with the declaration that double vengeance would be awarded them, for Jahwe was about to convert them into heroes.

This fierce conflict, pictured in boldest terms, with the sons of Zion on the one side and the sons of Greece on the other, has an appropriate historic background in the Graeco-syriac persecutions.³ The greatest crisis in Judaism between the Exile and

(see 12, 6) certainly not the slingstones. Perhaps ואכלו through a copyist's mistake, lost its right place, and should stand before ושתו »and they shall eat and drink etc.«

¹ LXX »And they shall drink them as wine« (omitting (המ)). Some amend המן with דמם »they shall drink their blood.«

² Or this bold figure may be also a reminiscence of the conqueror of Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah in Is. 63. i. e. dyed with their blood. There, however, the figure is drawn from the treading the winepress, here, from the sprinkling of the altar. Grotius (p. 129) referred the Is. passage to Judas Maccabeus.

³ It is a great leap, of over one a half centuries, between vss. 1-10 and vss. 12-17, but after having made this analysis I notice that the first book of the Maccabees has precisely the same historical order. After giving a short paragraph upon Alexander the Great the writer springs immediately to the age of Antiochus Epiphanes. The intervening Diadochen period had less of interest to the religious development of Judaism. The question suggests itself: Are chaps. 9-14 a part of the Maccabean Collection referred to in 2 Macc. 2, 13? (See footnote p. 21).

the Christian era was the attempt made to supplant Jewish institutions by Hellenism, accompanied by outrages on everything that was sacred to the Jew. In 170 B. C. Antiochus Epiphanes plundered Jerusalem, defiled the temple, robbing it of its treasures. Forbidding Jewish ceremonies, he offered swine upon an idol altar built on the ruins of the Jewish altar. He introduced Grecian games, massacred or crucified those who practiced circumcision, overthrew the city, burning its best structures. He sold Jews into slavery and committed atrocities in city and country, until bravery begotten by despair led to the Maccabean uprising.

Verses 12-17 are an appropriate witness to this crisis of Judaism, and accord well with other accounts furnished of this warfare, especially in I and II Maccabees. The wildness and fierceness of the attacks of the small band of the sons of Zion upon the superior numbers of the Greeks, the mingling of slingstone with sword, bow and arrow, in the rude combats of peasant populations, the vivid realization of divine aid and the sudden appearance of supernatural forms at critical moments, the merciless flying upon the prey, and the excessive exultation at the moment of victory, are all reflected here, and agree with the historic events. The two closing verses (16-17), with the eschatological formula **ביום ההוא** "in that day" contain a general promise and doxology ¹ clothed in a beautiful pastoral form, and are an appropriate conclusion to the piece.

¹ **יפיו** »his beauty« compare Ps. 45, 3. Is. 33, 17.

VI.

CHAPTER X.

Köhler, Stade and a multitude of interpreters consider that the division of chapters is not happy here and that chapter 10, 1-2 form the conclusion of chapter 9. Hitzig-Steiner argues against this, but, with others, regards 10, 1-2 as independent of what follows. I cannot agree with either of these conclusions, but, as we found 9, 16-17 an appropriate conclusion to chap. 9. so chapter 10 can be well explained as a unit. This piece of rhythmic prose is, in my view, more than an apocalypse or dream. It has also a didactic motive viz. of re-establishing and confirming the religion of Jahwe in the popular mind, as opposed to the inroads of the heathen cult, especially of holding the peasant population loyal to the national faith and national armies. Its historic background is, in general, the same as that of the foregoing with more of a distinctly religious purpose. If there exists here the didactic motive I have indicated, then vss. 1-2 are a proper introduction to the whole chapter and the transition, as we shall see, is natural, from the thought of Jahwe as the giver of rain,

to Jahwe as the giver of victories. We can gain a better impression of the unity of the piece, if we read it connectedly and note throughout the plea for the cause of Jahwe.

1. »Ask from Jahwe rain, at the time of latter rain.
»From Jahwe who formeth the lightnings.
»And showers of rain he will give them,
»To every man grass in his field.
2. »For the teraphim speak vanity,
»And the diviners see falsehood.
»Dreams of emptiness they relate.
»Fruitlessly they comfort.
»Therefore as sheep they (the people) are turned aside,
»They suffer, for there is no shepherd.
3. »Upon the shepherds burns mine anger,
»And upon the he-goats will I make visitation.
»For Jahwe of Hosts has visited his flock, the house
of Judah.
»And he will set them as his favorite steed in battle.
4. »From him the corner stone,
»From him the nail,
»From him the battle bow,
»From him go forth all the drivers together.
5. »And they shall be as heroes trampling (the foe),
»In the mire of the streets in battle.
»Yea, they shall fight, for Jahwe is with them.
»And the riders on horses shall be put to shame.
6. »And I will make strong the house of Judah,
»And the house of Joseph will I save.
»Yea, I will restore them, as I have pity for them.
»And they shall be as though I had not forsaken them.
»For I am Jahwe their God, and I will answer them.
7. »And Ephraim shall be as a hero.
»And their heart shall rejoice as with wine.
»Yea, their children they shall see and rejoice.
»Their heart shall exult in Jahwe.

8. »And I will whistle for them,
»Yea, I will gather them.
»For I have redeemed them.
»And they shall increase, as they have increased.
9. »When I sow them among the heathen,
»And in distant lands they remember me,
»Then they shall live with their children and return.
10. »And I will restore them from the land of Egypt.
»From Assyria also will I gather them.
»Then to the land of Gilead and Lebanon I will bring
them.
»Until (room) be not found for them.
11. »When he shall pass through the sea of distress,
»He shall smite in the sea the waves.
»And all the depths of the Nile shall be dried up.
»Then shall be brought down the pride of Assyria.
»And the sceptre of Egypt shall turn aside.
12. »For I will strengthen them in Jahwe,
»And in his name shall they walk.
»Is the saying of Jahwe.

The argument: Rain, the greatest pastoral blessing, especially the "latter rain", so necessary to good crops, must be asked of Jahwe. Jahwe gives the showers and the grass in the fields. Then follows (vs. 2) a denunciation of the teraphim cult and the practice of mantik. The writer enlarges on the text of Jeremiah 14: 22, where the power of Jahwe to give rain is contrasted with the "vanities" of the heathen, for this purpose. Here are named the teraphim and the qosemim, the diviners. The teraphim were introduced into Palestine from Mesopotamia. They were considered to be of great material protection (Gen. 31, 19. 30. 35). In the period of the Judges they were used by Micah, a worshiper of Jahwe

(Judg. 17 & 18). Samuel disapproved of their use (1 S. 15, 23), but David kept them in his house (1 S. 19, 13). Hosea foretells the day when the children of Israel should have no king, prince, sacrifice, pillar, ephod nor teraphim, as a day of calamity. Josiah's reform brought a decided attack upon their use (II Kings 23, 24). From that period the vanity and guilt of such idolatry were more and more emphasised. Ezek. 21, 26 [Heb.] makes their use the sin of the king of Babylon. In later Judaism, as seen from the Mishna, the hatred of this species of idolatry became intense.¹ That the Jews were still subject to the fascinations of a heathen cult, after the exile and into the Maccabean period, is clear from II Macc. 12, 32-45. The soldiers who were slain in the battle with Gorgias were found with heathen amulets

¹ See Levy's Chaldäisches Wörterbuch in loco. One can well see how these teraphim, which were formerly household gods simply, could come to be consulted for weather portents etc. If the usual derivation from the arabic *tarapha*, to live in comfort, *turphatun*, prosperous and comfortable life, be the correct one, (see Gesenius' Thesaurus p. 1520) then it is not strange that they were consulted on the subject of rain. (The identification of teraphim with the south palestinian seraphim, contended for by some scholars, is strongly disputed).

Parallel with the lifeless teraphim, as objects of consultation, were the *Qosemim*, practicers of *mantik*, often co-ordinated with the *Nebi'im*, especially when these were denounced (see Micah 3, 5. 6. Is. 3, 2). Here both teraphim and qosemim are denounced in strongest terms. These two species of idolatrous practice are here used by the prophet as general terms to designate every species of idolatry, which, in the introduction of Hellenism, tempted the Jew from Jahwe worship.

(ἱερῶματα εἰδῶλον) hidden under their coats.¹ It is likely therefore that the terms used in verse 2 are inclusive designations of the various methods of consultation of divinities and diviners and the multitude of heathen rites and practices which were introduced by the mixed foreign population which mingled freely with the Jews in the Grecian period.

In verse 3, with judgment pronounced against the leaders of the heathen cult, both inside and outside of Judaism,² a transition is easily made from the thought of Jahwe, the giver of pastoral blessings, to Jahwe, the giver of strength and prowess in war. Also the inner connection is seen between loyalty to the national faith, and heroism in the political crisis which was upon the nation. Jahwe (vs. 4) is the centre of the political system; from him³ are the corner stone which supports, and the nail which holds together. Also of the military power; from him are the battle bow and chariot drivers. Through Jahwe, vs. 5, the people shall become heroes to conquer and confuse the riders on horses. The house of Judah, which is already in the land, shall be strengthened, and Joseph and Ephraim, i. e. the diaspora, shall be saved and converted into heroes. Upon this favorite prophetic theme the writer naturally enlarges. Jahwe will whistle for those who are scattered among the

¹ See also Josephus Antiq. XVIII, 9, 5.

² The רֵעִים, shepherds, and the עֲתוּרִים, he-goats, are appropriate designations of the Greek friends inside of Judaism, and the Seleucidae outside. We meet these again in chap. 11.

³ »From him«, see Is. 28, 16. Ps. 118, 22.

nations, and restore them to their own land, where their increase shall be as in former days (vs. 5-8). Not only captives, but the colonists, who, with their offspring, lived in distant lands, should return, vs. 9. The figure of the people being sown as seed, was not an uncommon one in Hebrew literature (Ps. 106, 27. Hosea 2, 25 [Heb.]), but the figure is here modified and presents the picture of Jews in foreign lands without the immediate prospect of return. At the period in which we have set this writing, the Jewish colonists, especially in Egypt, had already attained great importance. According to Ps. 87 which already Olshausen and, since, many others have assigned to the Maccean period, the birth of Jews in foreign places was a reason for these places receiving Jahwe's notice. Of them it should be said, "this man was born there." The lands of the diaspora are here in general terms designated Egypt and Assyria. In the Grecian period the Jewish writers meant by the term "Assyria", Syria,¹ or the lands of the north. The returned exiles were to be gathered "into the land of Gilead and Lebanon." In these districts were already many Jews, but they were annoyed and oppressed by the heathen. The prophetic promise is that these quarters should be filled with Jews. Though the actual territory held

¹ Herodotus VII, 63 says concerning Syria: »This people whom the Greeks call Syrians are called Assyrians by the barbarians«. See also Rawlinson's note to Herodotus, Bk. I. 6 and Bk. VI. 63. Hitzig's Article »Assyrien« in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexikon, and Cheyne's note on Ps. 83, 9. Comp. Is. 27, 12-13. See Driver's Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Samuel. Introduction p. X.

by the Jews under Judas was very narrow, comprising little more than Jerusalem and the Judean hills, and though the excursions into the border,¹ especially into Gilead, by the Maccabean brothers, after the death of Antiochus, were for the relief and rescue of oppressed Jews in those quarters, nevertheless the conception of the extent of Jewish control in the future, included the whole of Palestine. In verse 11, Jahwe becomes the subject of discourse, abruptly resumed from verse 4, though the general contents of the verse connect well with the preceding. Jahwe here is the hero, as in 9, 14, at the head of the host. Here he leads through the sea of distress.² The reminiscence of the Red sea deliverance was always freshest in the Jewish consciousness at the moment of greatest peril. It was a favorite figure of the writers in the Maccabean crisis. The author of the 1st Bk. of the Maccabees, in his description of the battle of Emmaus, has Judas, when he found himself shut in between the "camp of the heathen" and the trained detachment under Gorgias, cheer his soldiers with the memory of the Red sea deliverance (1 Macc. 4, 8-9). Here are repeated the prophetic expectations of Is. 11. Is. 27. and Micah 7.

¹ See Conder's »Judas Maccabeus« p. 109, 119 and Schürer I. pp. 142-3.

² בַּיָּם should be בַּיָּם. This is the method usually adopted to get a readable text. Stade, following Klostermann, recommends for צָרָה, צָרָה-»to Tyre.« and holds the clause »and he shall smite in the sea the waves« to be a gloss copied in a mistaken manner from 9, 4 »and he shall smite in the sea her riches« i. e. חֵילֶיהָ for חֵילֶיהָ.

The second clause of vs. 11 seems to refer to the drying up of the Nile, (Is. 11, 15) followed by the prophecy of the humiliation of Syria (Assyria) and Egypt, the two parts of the last great kingdom of Daniel's image (the Grecian, Dan. 2). That Jahwe is the subject of **עֵבֶר**¹ in vs. 11^a agrees with vs. 12 where he is made the source of the strength, and his name of the sustenance of Israel. This plea for Jahwe as the object of the worship and trust of the people tempted to a heathen cult, is emphasised by the threefold repetition of his name in the climax clause (vs. 12).

Thus the whole tenor of chap. 10, with the didactic motive which we have discovered and its historic environments, so far as we can divine them from allusions to national events and conditions, points to the Maccabean period as its appropriate setting.

¹ If **צִרְה** should be read **צִרְה** then of course Ephraim would be the subject of **עֵבֶר**.

VII.

CHAPTER XI.

In chapter 11 I do not discover any elements which require for it a different historic situation from the preceding. Its direct prophetic purpose is, however, different from that of chap. 10. The motive in chapter 10 we found to be the winning of the people, throughout the country, from a heathen cult to the worship of Jahwe and to loyalty to his armies. That in chapter 11 is to rebuke the secularization of the religious leaders at the centre of government. This different motive is accompanied by a change of style and rhetorical method. The former is light, easily grasped; Jahwe is the giver of rain, the source of political and military strength, the hero and deliverer in the national crisis. The latter is obscure, with meaning hidden under prosopopoeia, allegory and symbolic action, at the same time more massive and powerful. The former, being for the people, is full of hope and encouragement, the latter being for the leaders, contains the darkest picture. Henderson correctly admitted that there was no message in chap. 11 for the period of the restoration of the temple.¹

¹ See above in II.

Eichhorn,¹ though considering it the product of a later age, declares that the whole section 11, 1—13, 6 has no contents by which we can determine the period of its authorship. If, however, we give it the background of the Maccabean age, when the hostile power of the north was bursting like a storm-cloud of fire and devastation upon the whole land, and when this outward storm had its counterpart in the internal corruption, when the religious leaders were secularized, when the highpriesthood was sold to the highest bidder, and the offices of religion were the reward of bribes, we can see how it affords the intensest meaning for the age in which it was written. The complete secularization of the one party produced the intense religious consciousness of the other, and from the depth of this consciousness could well have issued the contents of chapter 11. The two ideas of the writer seem to be, first: the bursting in of a world power from without, which was apparent to all, and secondly: the development of a world spirit within, which should disrupt the nation.

The first part, contained in vss. 1-3, is an apostrophe in poetic form, comprising a distich and two tetrastichs.

1. »Open, Lebanon, thy doors,
»That fire may devour thy cedars.
2. »Howl pinetree.
»For the cedar has fallen. [אֲשֶׁר אֲדִירִים שָׁרְרוּ]²
»Howl, oaks of Bashan,
»For the inaccessible forest has gone down.

¹ Einleitung IV. 449.

² »For the glorious ones are destroyed.« The original of this clause is in vs. 3.

3. »Hark! the wailing of the shepherds!
»For their glory is destroyed.
»Hark! the roaring of young lions!
»For the pride of the Jordan is overthrown.

Von Ortenberg¹ and a great number of critics, earlier and later, hold vss. 1-3 to be an independent prophecy. Others consider them the conclusion of chap. 10.² Others consider them to be simply a marginal production which afterward got into the text between chapters 10 and 11 without any relation to the context. Stade (I. p. 70), who explains these verses as a mechanical working over of Jer. 25, 34-38, shows, however, the unity of authorship between them and the following, on the ground that vs. 3 is influenced by Jer. 12, 5 and vs. 4 by Jer. 12, 3. According to our analysis vss. 1-3 are a necessary part of the author's plan, and the literary material from the earlier prophets, which he has by heart, and which he consciously or unconsciously uses, he models into a new form, just as from the same stones very different structures can be built. Here the burning cedars of Lebanon, the falling forests of Bashan, the howling of the pine trees and oaks, the wailing of the shepherds, the roaring of the lions and the laying waste of the Arabah, are bold forms of speech to represent the external catastrophe, corresponding to the internal disruption which he is about to describe under allegory and symbolic action, in vss. 4-14.

The flock of slaughter, vs. 4, is the victim of the

¹ Bestandtheile etc. p. 74.

² Hofmann: Weissagung und Erfüllung I, p. 316.

world-spirit in the leaders and shepherds, who had so far lost the sense of the sacredness of the priest's office, that they were, in Jahwe's name, making traffic of the people, and with light word play upon their historic faith blessing Jahwe that they were getting rich (vs. 5). The giving over of the people of the land to the prey of destructive forces¹ (vs. 6) expresses the inner relation of the whole symbolic action to the devastating external power portrayed in vss. 1-3. The result of the secularization of the leaders and hence the disintegration of the people, created the susceptibility to ruin expressed by "Open, Lebanon, thy doors."²

The writer then represents himself as undertaking to feed the flock, in commission of the traffickers (vs. 7). "Then I fed the flock of slaughter for the traffickers of the sheep." The reading לִכְנָעַנִי suggested by Stade, though disputed, is undoubtedly the correct one. The expression לִכְנָעַנִי (vs. 7) and the similar expression כִּן עֲנִי (vs. 11) do not otherwise give a satisfactory sense. What would "therefore" refer to? The LXX translate εἰς τὴν λαχναστυν, (vs. 7) and

¹ רַעְהוּ, his neighbour, should probably be read רַעְהוּ, his shepherd, parallel with »his king«. The kings = the Seleucidae, »the shepherds« = the high priests, who were selling the people into their hands.

² With this view we cannot of course translate יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ of vs. 6 as Köhler, Wright and others »inhabitants of the earth«, but as the A. E. V. and R. E. V. »inhabitants of the land.« So also Luther, Zunz's Bibel, Osterwald, Segond and others. Not the nations, but the land and people of the Jews, are here the object.

χαναανῶνι (vs. 11). In Hos. 12, 8 כָּנַעַן is used in the sense of merchant, or trafficker. So also in Zech. 14, 21, the word כָּנַעֲנִי is properly translated trafficker. See also Ezek. 16, 3. The leaders of the people in vs. 5 are painted under the figure of merchants dealing in the people, and these expressions in verses 7 and 11 appropriately carry out the figure.

The prophetic purpose in the symbolic handling of the two staves is evidently to show that true government, symbolized by these, is not possible under the present order, the one staff נָעַם, favor, symbolizing Jahwe's covenant with the nations for the protection of Israel, and the other הִכָּלִים, unity,¹ symbolizing the ideal national brotherhood and internal concord.

In the action described in verse 8, of the cutting off of the three shepherds² in one month, and the refusal to feed the flock, it is difficult to determine whether the writer had in mind three distinct persons who in

¹ From part. of חָבַל, to bind. »Bands« would require חֲבָלִים. Comp. vs. 14.

² Some critics have suggested the supplying of אֲשֶׁר and reading »I cut off the three shepherds, which were in one month.« (See von Ortenberg and Hitzig-Steiner in loco.) This is not necessary. The rendering defended by Köhler seems to me justifiable: »I cut off three of the shepherds in one month.« Compare Ex. 26, 3 חֲמִשָּׁה הַיְרִיעוֹת. The A.E.V. reads »the five curtains«, which is not good, because five curtains are not hitherto mentioned. The R.E.V. corrects and reads »five curtains« i. e. five of the ten before mentioned. So here the Jahwe-appointed shepherd cuts off three of the shepherds, i. e. of those mentioned in vs. 5.

one month were cut off, or whether, with objectively figurative language, he meant simply to portray the swift destruction of the shepherds. The seeking here for the literal action of the Jahwe-appointed shepherd has led, in the course of criticism, to the finding of twenty or more different groups of three persons who might be the three shepherds, from Moses, Aaron and Miriam by Jerome, to Galba, Otho and Vitellius by Calmet, or of classes of leaders as Prophet, Priest and King,¹ Pharisee, Sadducee and Essene. Against the suggestion of post-exilic characters, Judas, Jonathan and Simon, Antiochus Epiphanes, Eupator and Demetrius, the defenders of the pre-exilic authorship settled upon Zecharia, Shallum and some unknown pretender, as the three shepherds.² If we were zealous to find three persons who could appropriately be in the mind of the writer at the period in which we have set the writing of chap. 11, they would be *Lysimachus*, *Jason* and *Menelaus*, all of whom exercised the priest's office in a disgraceful manner, and were cut off within a comparatively short period. After Menelaus had bought the priesthood from Antiochus by offering three hundred talents of silver more tax than Jason, the latter was compelled to flee to the land of the Ammonites. Menelaus, being obliged to go to Antioch,

¹ This was Delitzsch's view in his last work, *Messianische Weissagungen* p. 150, following, as he says, the precedence of Ephrem, Theodoret and Cyrill.

² Stade from the standpoint of the Diadochan period thinks upon the three world-kingdoms which had hitherto hindered the advent of the kingdom of God (i. e. the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian).

left the office of the priesthood in Jerusalem with his brother Lysimachus. This latter committed so many sacrileges and outrages in Jerusalem, in robbing the temple to raise the tax which his brother had promised, that a mutiny was raised against him, and though he resisted the people with an army, they, resorting to stones and clubs, finally killed him beside the treasury. When the report was spread abroad that Antiochus had died in Egypt, Jason returned from his exile, with a thousand men, to recover the highpriesthood, and assaulted the city, forcing Menelaus into the castle. On the return, however, of Antiochus from Egypt, he was again obliged to flee to the Ammonites. There, being accused before Aretas, king of the Arabians, he fled into Egypt and thence into Lacedemonia, where he pitifully perished. Menelaus, hoping to add the governorship of Jerusalem to his highpriesthood, attempted to play into the hand of Antiochus Eupator, as the latter marched against Jerusalem. He, however, awakened rather suspicion, was accused by Lysias before the king, and was brought to Beroea in Syria and there put to death by being thrown into a tower of ashes, and the highpriesthood passed over to Alcimus.¹ The character of Jason, Menelaus and Lysimachus is precisely that of the traffickers of the flock portrayed in chapter 11. Their destruction however was not in one month, but covered a period of seven or eight years, 171 B.C. - 163 B.C. This method,

¹ See 2. Macc. chapters 4, 5, 13. Prideaux II, 174-239. Stade-Holtzmann: Geschichte des Volkes Israel II, 317f.

however, of expressing longer periods, and of hiding literal occurrences under allegorical terms, is not uncommon, so that the "one month" might mean simply swift destruction.¹

The indignation extends also against the people. Their case is hopeless; let the dying die and let the remnants consume each other (vs. 9). The ideal staves were not the correct symbols of the present social order. If each man were following whatever party or leader he chose (as 6^b), then let the staff נַעַם be broken (vs. 10), and the covenant of Jahwe with the nations for Israel's protection be annulled — let Lebanon open her doors and the fire devour. The attention of the traffickers² (vs. 11) is called to the picture. Those who regard it shall know that it is the דְּבַר־יְהוָה that is at work. In the picture which follows is exhibited the little value which the people set upon the Jahwe rule. In the secularization of public life, the religious service is held to be of little value. The new shepherd asks for his hire. The price of a slave (Ex. 21, 32) is weighed out to him. At Jahwe's command he casts it to a potter³ as an

¹ Comp. Jeremiah's 70 years which, in Daniel, become 490 years.

² כַּנְעָנִי = כֶּן עֲנִי as in vs. 7. Comp. p. 51:

³ This, assuming that יוֹצֵר is the proper text. The R. E. V. (Margin) following the reading of a host of interpreters, has »treasury«, אוֹצָר, explained as being the original reading for which יוֹצֵר is a mistake, or that the latter is an Aramaism for the former. The LXX has χυμεντήριον = foundry. Wright follows a number of scholars, in arguing at great length for the rendering »potter«. Second translates »pour

amount adapted to the small business of making clay vessels, but despicable as representing the popular estimate of the services of a Jahwe-appointed shepherd. Then the staff *Unity* is broken. The new order, secularization, not only opened the doors of Lebanon and let in the devouring enemy, but also forfeited the national brotherhood. The expression "in order to break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel" has given criticism the greatest perplexity, and determined the majority of critics to put the prophecy in a pre-exilic period, when the kingdoms of Judah and Israel still existed. But, to be consistent, if we assign the prophecy to a pre-exilic period we should put it back as far as the days of Solomon, for though the kingdoms of Judah and Israel existed under the kings, the *brotherhood*, which is here spoken of as being broken, never existed after the days of Jeroboam's revolt. In our view the writer uses the idea of the disruption which the nation had once encountered, and which had never been healed,¹ as a figure of the disruption which was now again taking place between those loyal to Judaism,² to the national faith, and those who were doing their best to break down their traditions and to introduce the gods and the cult of

le potier.« Driver on the other hand adopts »treasury«. The Syriac reads »the treasury«, and the Targum, according to Buxtorf »treasurer«. Both »potter« and »the treasury« give a sense. If the word treasury be adopted, then the meaning is that the shepherd, as Jahwe's servant, is commanded to throw the money into Jahwe's treasury.

¹ The separation of Israel from Judah was looked on as the saddest fact in the national history. Is. 7. 17.

² Comp. 1 Macc. 2, 42. 7, 13. Also Schürer I, 147.

the heathen. In the symbolical representation of the breaking of the staff *Unity*, to portray the breach which was taking place before his eyes, we cannot bind the writer to a literal expression. On the other hand his meaning would be all the more impressive by the term "to break the brotherhood of Judah and Israel." Two other explanations of this term, appropriate to the age in which we have set this writing, can be given, though, to me, not quite as satisfactory. Since the days of the great disruption it had been an ideal of the prophets that Judah and Israel should again be united.¹ In the writer's portrayal of the breaking up of the nation, when Jahwe would no more lead them, but give every man over to his own shepherd and king, by the breaking of the staff *Unity* he meant to declare that the hope of reunion, the ideal brotherhood which the prophets had cherished, was now broken. The other explanation, still less satisfactory, is that the writer here meant by Judah, Jerusalem and Judah, and by Israel, those who lived further off e. g. in Egypt, and that Jerusalem, in the condition of strife and weakness into which it had fallen, was no longer able to hold Israel to its central sanctuary. The separation which finally led Onias IV to build a Jewish temple and establish a sanctuary in Egypt, must have been long in its development, and could already have been keenly felt when, on the death of Onias III at the instigation of Menelaus, Onias IV, the rightful heir to the high-

¹ Compare Hos. 2, 2. 3, 5. Amos 9, 11. Mic. 2, 12. 5, 2. Is. 11, 13. Especially the notable passage Ezek. 37, 15-28.

priesthood, was unjustly deprived of that office and was obliged to flee into Egypt.

The successor of Menelaus in the highpriest's office was the impious Alcimus, who could well be the model for the foolish shepherd (vs. 15-17) who followed upon the rejection of the Jahwe-appointed shepherd. His persecutions of the Chasidim, his incitations of Demetrius against Judas Maccabeus, his attempt to make his Jewish subjects conform to heathen practices, his breaking down the wall of partition which had kept the uncircumcised from intruding into the holy part of the sanctuary, could well bring upon him the curse of vs. 17, viz: that "a wasting away¹ should attack his right arm and his right eye, that his arm should dry up and his right eye become thoroughly dark". The tradition concerning him, preserved in the record of the Maccabees,² is that he was "plagued and his enterprises hindered; for his mouth was stopped and he was taken with a palsy, so that he could no more speak anything, nor give order concerning his house," and that he "died at that time with great torment."

If we have succeeded in finding the historic situation and prophetic motive of this writing, we can understand that the intensity of its meaning to its age, and the severity of its sentiment, needed the obscuration of symbolical language.

¹ Perhaps חרב should be read here instead of חרב, sword, as it is a better parallel to יבּוּשׁ. Also »the sword upon the right eye« is a difficult reading.

² 1 Macc. 9, 55.

VIII.

CHAPTER XII.

In chapter 12, we are in the same historical environment but are conscious of a different prophetic motive. The political situation is the same, — the same disturbed condition of social life, the same overflowing of secularization, with its attendant dangers from without and within. But the whole tone of the production is different from that of the preceding. In chap. 11 there is no compromise, no hope of unity. The separation of the two parties is complete and hopeless. Here, (chap. 12), there is conciliation, a clear endeavor to unite diverse elements, to heal an ever widening breach. This entire change of tone does not indicate a different hand, but only a change of occasion and purpose. Chap. 11 was ecclesiastical in its symbolism, and the portrayal of a wicked and secular priesthood was its motive. Chap. 12 presents the social side, is meant for the popular mind, and appeals to the deepest domestic and social feelings. Its purpose is more akin to that of chapter 10, to win back the popular mind, in that case, from a false worship, in this case, from seductive social practices. The writer gains his purpose by an apocalypse of a universal

siege of Jerusalem in which all nations shall participate. He attracts attention to his picture by figures drawn from the social practices common in Jerusalem since the introduction of the new Greek life. In the bacchanalian feasts, in which the mixed population joined, and which tempted the unwary Jew to intoxication and debauch, the writer sees Jerusalem (vs. 2) as a **כַּף־רַעַל**¹ — a bowl² of reeling — to all nations, i. e. an intoxicating bowl, around which the nations are sitting and drinking.

Jason, the high priest, had established “under the acropolis”,³ i. e. under the hill of the upper city and immediately in the vicinity of the temple hill, a Grecian gymnasium where the Jewish youth were trained in the heathen games. Among other exercises the *stone* was lifted to exhibit the strength of the arm. If it proved too heavy, it hurt the hand of the lifter. So Jerusalem is seen by the prophet as a *burdensome stone* (vs. 3) to the nations who were attempting to toss her. The two figures in this apocalypse are consolatory. All the nations which the prophet sees assembling for the siege of the Holy City (vss. 1 and 4), shall become drunken and bruised. Also the horses of the nations shall be blinded and their riders confused (vs. 4). The conciliatory motive in the writing is seen in its attempt to close the breach which existed

¹ The LXX *ὡς πρόθυρα σαλευόμενα* »as a staggering threshold«. Vulgate: »Superliminare crapulae«, »intel of intoxication.«

² The earlier writers have **כּוּס**, cup, instead of **כַּף**, bowl. Is. 51, 17. 22. Jer. 51, 7. 49, 12. 25, 15. Ps. 75, 8.

³ LXX of 2 Macc. 4, 12. comp. 1 Macc. 1, 33.

between Jerusalem and Judah i. e. between those of the religious centre and those living in the outlying cities and districts. The chronicler of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra 2, 1. Neh. 11, 12) relates that the returned Jews cast lots as to which should dwell in Jerusalem and which should occupy the cities of Judah and the outlying districts. Thereafter Jerusalem and Judah technically speaking, meant city and country.¹ Alongside of the breach which existed between those attracted to the new cult and those zealous for the ancient Hebrew faith, there is observable the development of an alienation between Judah and Jerusalem.² There are here several traces of the writer's endeavor to conciliate Judah. 1st, in the expression in vs. 2, "And upon Judah it shall be, in the siege against Jerusalem." ³ If the Hebrew text be correct here, the

¹ In 2 Macc. 1, 10 we have this division of the people referred to in the expression »the people that were at Jerusalem and in Judea.«

² Jerusalem had the advantage in possessing the temple and fortress, in being the central point of worship, in having more genuine Jews and fewer of the גוֹיִם than the country districts, also there should occur the judgment and there appear the glory. So that even in New Testament times the עַם הָאָרֶץ were not looked upon as quite equal to the inhabitants of the city. Here it is to be remembered that the Hasmonian heroes were »Judeans« of Modin, and not originally of Jerusalem.

³ עַל־יְהוּדָה יִהְיֶה. The LXX ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἔσται etc. »And in Judah shall be the siege against Jerusalem.« Stade and others follow Geiger (Urschrift und Übersetzung der Bibel p. 58) and erase על, reading: »Und auch Judah wird Jerusalem mitbelagern.« i. e. fight with the heathen against Je-

intimate concern of Judah in Jerusalem's fortunes is emphasised. 2^{ndly}, in the special notice of favor to Judah in vs. 4. 3^{rdly}, Judah should recognise in Jerusalem a source of strength (v. 5).¹ 4^{thly}. On the other hand, Judah should fight valiantly for Jerusalem (vs. 6). 5^{thly}. Judah should be the first delivered, that the glory of Jerusalem should not be above that of Judah (vs. 7).

With the same prevailing motive of conciliation the writer, repeating the eschatological formula **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא**, portrays the divine protection of Jerusalem, the heroic and supernatural powers with which the citizens should be endowed,² and Jahwe's purpose to destroy the enemies of the nation (vss. 8-9).

The writer, having been led into this apocalypse of the future deliverance of the united people, be-thinks himself of a bloodguiltiness which rested upon the nation (vs. 10), and which, when the outpouring of the spirit of grace and of prayer gave them a true insight into their guilt, would occasion a uni-

rusalem. Should this emendation be justifiable, the motive of reconciliation would be taken from the sentence, but on the other hand it would express a fact of the Maccabean period, that many Jews were compelled to fight in the armies of the Syrians, against their own countrymen.

¹ The LXX probably read **לָנוּ נִמְצָא** instead of **לִי אִמְצָא**. Vulg. has: *Confortentur mihi habitatores Jerusalem.* Zunz's Bibel: »Eine Stütze sind mir die Bewohner Jeruschalaims.«

² The weak and stumbling should be as David, i. e. endowed with royalty, and those of the David line should be as Elohim and as the angel of Jahwe, i. e. possessed of a divine glory. With this apocalypse of the wonderful exaltation of Israel, compare that of Daniel (Dan. 12, 1-3).

versal mourning. It is possible that the prophet here had in mind, as the object of this mourning, the conservative part of the people, which suffered for fidelity to the national faith. Those persisting in observing the law were persecuted, hunted to the death. Women who were discovered having their children circumcised, were crucified with their babes dangling upon their necks. Thus the faithful or ideal Israel were, like the עֶבֶר יְהוּה of deutero-Isaiah, suffering for the whole nation. In this persecution, those of the nation who were either outspoken friends of the Greeks, or by indifference gave countenance to the outrages, were themselves guilty of piercing the heart of Jahwe, represented in his ideal people. For this the house of David and the people of Jerusalem were responsible and guilty, and, looking upon him¹ whom they had pierced, they should mourn. That many a Jew who had gone over to the Grecian party, upon seeing a friend or relative crucified for fidelity to the faith, turned back to Judaism, is one of the traditions of that period. From the language of vs. 10 f. however, we look for some person who was before the writer's mind. This could, at that period, be no other than the good high priest Onias III who had served the people twenty-four years, and whose fidelity to the faith of his fathers, and antagonism to the outrages practiced in the name of religion, was murdered at the instigation of the unprincipled

¹ The pointing of אֱלִי should evidently be אֵלִי = אֵל, to, toward. See, Siegfried und Stade, Wörterbuch in loco. Ges. § 103. Job. 3, 22 etc.

Grecian-friend Menelaus.¹) His death caused a mourning on the part of all classes, because of the integrity of his character, and even the dissolute Antiochus avenged his blood upon his murderer Andronicus.

That he was later held in greatest honor by the Jews, is witnessed to in their traditions (2 Macc. 15, 12 f.). In a dream which Judas Maccabeus relates that he had on the eve of the battle with Nicanor, Onias and Jeremiah appear as the intercessors with God "for the people and for the holy city". We can well see, therefore, how the writer here, probably one of the most devout of the Chasidim, seeking to conciliate various diverse elements, should nevertheless see Jerusalem, in the day that there should be an outpouring of grace and prayer, confessing its guilt for, and lamenting over, the murder of the pious Onias. The grief should be as a mourning for the only son, and as bitterness over the first-born, i. e. it should be intense and personal.² There should also be great lamentation throughout the city.

»In that day, great shall be the mourning in Jerusalem,

»As the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo.«

The seeking on the part of scholars for the person

¹ II Macc. 4, 34f.

² With יְחִיד and כְּבוֹד compare כָּאֵבֶל אִם (Ps. 35, 14). »As one mourning for a mother.« Also אֵבֶל יְחִיד, Jer. 6, 26. Amos 8, 10. We see no need therefore, (comp. Kneucker, Schenkel's Bibel-Lexicon II p. 564) of seeing in יְחִיד, Hadad of the Hadadrimmon (vs. 11), nor of the identification, by Conder (Heth and Moab p. 78), of the »bitter day«, which is the parallel of the אֵבֶל יְחִיד of the Amos passage, with the »bitter tree« from which Thammuz was born.

referred to in the latter clause of this parallel has resulted in a long and still continued discussion. Those holding the traditional view, current since St. Jerome, contend that the writer refers here to the death of king Josiah who fell in a battle with Necho, in the valley of Megiddo, B. C. 609. The opposing view is, that by Hadadrimmon the writer meant Adonis, the Phœnician god of the spring, whose death and disappearance in midsummer were bewailed with imposing festivals. Neither of these views is entirely satisfactory.

As to the first view, we have no facts which connect Josiah with Hadadrimmon. According to at least one source,¹ he did not even die in the valley of Megiddo, nor was the mourning for him there, but at Jerusalem. Köhler will make it analogous to the expression "the mourning over Leipsic", by the French. We have however, no account of Hadadrimmon being a stronghold, or a field that was lost, or a place where a battle was lost. The record concerning King Josiah is that he fell in the valley of Megiddo, smitten by the archers of the king of Egypt. The expression in the text, "as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo", would require much straining to make it refer to the mourning over Josiah.

The opposing view is equally difficult. It would require the text to read: "Great shall be the mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon, i. e. over Hadadrimmon, i. e. over Adonis, in the valley of Megiddo." The chief objection to this is

¹ Compare 2 Kings 23, 29 with 2 Chr. 35, 23-24.

that we cannot identify Hadadrimmon with Adonis.¹ Hadad and Rimmon were names of Syrian deities, and they entered into the names of Syrian kings, as Hadadezer, Benhadad, Tabrimmon² etc. The compounding of the names of two deities was common, thus indicating that the one possessed also the attributes of the other. Hadadrimmon was such a compound name. Adonis (lord) was the Phœnician divinity whose worship was adopted by other nations, especially by the Greeks, but we cannot supply the link which identifies this divinity with Hadadrimmon. The writer had probably no distinct personality in mind, (neither Josiah nor Adonis), but simply a *place*,³ Hadadrimmon, in the valley of Megiddo, where mourning festivals were held. This is all that the text itself warrants. In the first clause, the idea emphasised is that the mourning shall be *great* in *Ferusalem*. In the second clause of the comparison we are to expect another place to be mentioned where there was great mourning, and this is expressed by "as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo". "In the valley of Megiddo" is simply a localising of Hadadrimmon. When we bear in mind the multitude of mourning festivals celebrated in the Orient, such as the mourning for kings,⁴ the festival

¹ See Baudissin: Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte I. p. 305ff. Schrader: K. A. T. 454.

² See Movers: Die Phœnizier, I. C. 7. p. 196. 2 Kings 5, 18. 1 Kings 15, 18.

³ For compound names as designations of localities compare Baal-peor, Baal-hamon etc.

⁴ Comp. Gen. 50, 10. 1 Sam. 31, 13.

of the virgins in remembrance of Jephtha's daughter,¹ also the elaborate ceremonies of lament for the deities of the changing seasons, as the lamentation over the Babylonian Thammuz, son of life,² and over the Phœnician Adonis, with imposing ceremonies in mid-summer; also that these festivals, especially the Phœnician, were lifted into greater importance when adopted by the Greeks, we would expect that certain localities, like the Jew's wailing-place in Jerusalem to-day, would become well known centres for these festivals. The Targum, quoted by Köhler, hints at the fact that the prophet had no single personality in mind, when it says that he meant Ahab and Josiah. To my mind, we learn from this passage, in the absence of more definite sources of knowledge, that Hadadrimmon was a well known centre³ of these festivals of mourning in the Grecian period.

The land should mourn (vs. 12). In order to give in a single paragraph a most comprehensive picture of the universal lamentation, the writer mentions the royal and priestly lines in the history of Israel, i. e. he names David and a son of David (2 Sam. 5, 14), Levi and a Levite (Ex. 6, 17. Num. 3, 17), and all who did not belong to either of these,

¹ Judges 11, 40.

² Ezek. 8, 1-14. This festival was held in the sixth month, September.

³ The absence of the **ב** loci before **הדררמון** was that which led scholars to think of Hadadrimmon as the object of the mourning rather than the designation of a locality, and hence it was sought to identify it with Adonis. For the use of the genitive instead of the preposition, however, compare Micah 1, 11 **מספר בית האצל** »The mourning of Beth-ezel.«

he includes under the "families that remain".¹ This evident endeavor to be all inclusive in this description of the mourning, first drawing a picture of household grief, then the lamentation in the city, then the mourning through the land, the families apart, and the sexes apart, not only shows the writer's intense sympathy with the pierced one of vs. 10, and his conviction of the guilt of the nation, but also the desire to unify, which we observed in the first half of the chapter, seen also in the introduction, in which he uses the antique, all inclusive term of "Israel", as the object of the word of Jahwe.

¹ Abraham Geiger (Urschrift und Übersetzung p. 59) explains Beth David as the descendants of Zerubbabel, the Shimeites as the descendants of Zerubbabel's brother Shimei (1 Chron. 3, 19), and Nathan as Jonathan, the father of Jadua (Neh. 12, 11) and Manasseh, who became the chief priest of the Samaritans. Whatever difficulty there may be in this explanation, Wright's objection to it, that it sets the prophetic writing too late, is not sufficient.

IX.

CHAPTER XIII, 1-6.

The passage 13, 1-6 is in close connection with chap. 12, 10-14. In each case the movement is from the centre outward, from Beth David¹ and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to the whole land. The fountain, the washing place in an oriental community, suggests the **מִקְוֶה** for the moral filth of the metropolis. The Graeco-Syrian customs had introduced indecencies which were not only offensive to the native modesty of the Jew, but also in direct opposition to the Torah (1 Macc. 1, 48-49). This corruption of the metropolis was equalled by that of the country districts, in the idolatrous practices of the heathen cult which had not ceased to attract the Jewish element. The cleansing of the land from idols is in reminiscence of Hos. 2, 19, though the word there is **בעלים**, while here the more general name for idols, **עֲצָבִים**, is used. The remarkable power of idolatry over the Jews in the Grecian period is seen in the traditions preserved in the Books of the Mac-

¹ See under chap. 10.

cabees,¹ and the prophecy of the extinction of idols from the land, was not yet antiquated.²

The prophecy of the total extinction of professional prophets and corrupt spirits (vs. 2^b f.), has its appropriate historic situation in this post-exilic period. After the return from the Exile there gradually developed a class of men who made nebiism a trade. Already in the fifth century B. C. Nehemiah was annoyed by them.³ They were hirelings, and prophesied according to the wish of those who employed them.⁴ In the late Old Testament, pre-Christian period, the belief gained ground that the true prophetic order was past, and that no more prophets would appear before the coming of Elijah.⁵ The writer of the passage before us, evidently, like Amos,⁶ distinguished between himself and the prophetic class. Amos, however,

¹ See 1 Macc. 1, 11. 43 etc.

² If Ps. 16 is a product of the Maccabean period, as many scholars hold, it contains, besides the complacency and thankfulness for a goodly heritage in Jahwe, also the strongest protest of Jewish piety against the idolatry to which many were yielding (vs. 4). The argument of the Psalm is the same whether עֲצָבוֹתָם be translated »their sorrows«, »ihre Schmerzen«, as is still done by most versions (even Cheyne, »griefs«), or, »their idols«, as Gesenius and many scholars more recent.

³ Neh. 6, 7-14.

⁴ Compare the *ψευδοπροφήτης* of the first christian century. Mtt. 7, 15. 24, 11. Acts 13, 6. 2 Pet. 2, 1. 1 John 4, 1 etc. For characters of like spirit though differing in method comp. also John 10, 12-13 *μισθωτός* »hireling«. Acts 8, 20 *τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνόμισας διὰ χρημάτων πᾶσθαι*.

⁵ 1 Macc. 9, 27. 4, 46.

⁶ Amos 7, 14.

in speaking of his own call did not reflect against the prophetic order of his day. But in the period of our author, the consciousness that the order of true prophets had ceased, together with the degeneracy of the class of prophets, who, in imitation of the Syrian practices, cut themselves on the arms and back in order to produce ecstasy or to compel the presence of the divinity, gives sufficient occasion for the strong denunciation of the whole class (vss. 2-7).¹ In the critical period of the battle between Judaism and the Greco-Syrian heathenism, the writer in his vision of "that day", i. e. the day of Jahwe, saw first, an indignation which would lead a father and a mother to pierce through a son who should practice nebiism, and secondly, that nebiism would be so stigmatised by the popular conscience that the man who had practiced it would be ashamed of his vision, would have laid aside his prophetic garb and would dissemble the true source of his scars. This is not necessarily a contradiction of the representations of Joel (3, 1) and Jeremiah (31, 34) of the universal prophetic gift in the Messianic age, but rather a supplement to these utterances. As an outburst of indignation upon the present corrupt practices, it is an expressed hope of the total extinction of professional nebiism.

¹ For the original and later conception of the meaning of self-castigation in heathen usage, see Pietschmann's *Geschichte der Phoenizier* p. 164, in Oncken's *allgemeine Geschichte*. Comp. the Baal prophets 1 K. 18, 28.

X.

CHAPTER XIII, 7-9.

»Sword, awake upon my shepherd,
»Even upon the man of my companionship,
»Is the saying of Jahwe of Hosts.
»Strike the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered;
»And I shall turn my hand upon the little ones.
»And it shall be that in all the land, saith Jahwe,
»Two parts therein shall be cut off and shall perish,
»But the third part shall remain therein.
»And I will cause this third to pass through the fire.
»Yea, I will purify them as the purifying of silver,
»And I will try them as the testing of gold.
»They shall call upon my name, and I will answer them:
»I will say: This is my people,
»And they shall say: Jahwe is my God.«

This seemingly detached fragment of rhythmic prose has caused interpreters great perplexity. Hitzig, Wright and others, seek an inner connection between these verses and what immediately precedes. But the scene here is certainly entirely changed, and the theme new. Ewald, von Ortenberg, Stade, Cheyne, Driver and perhaps the majority of the more recent critics, consider this passage a suitable conclusion to chapter 11, 15-17. This explanation, however, has also

its difficulties. A shepherd is concerned in each case, but in the allegory of chap. 11, after the prophet, in the rôle of a good shepherd, was loathed and paid off in an unappreciative manner, he was commanded to take the instruments of the foolish shepherd. The prediction was that Jahwe should raise up a base shepherd, who should devour the flock. A curse is pronounced upon him, viz: a complete withering of the right arm, and a total blindness of the right eye,¹ in consequence of his neglect and robbery of the flock. Under his regime the flock is scattered, lost, broken. The death of such a shepherd would be a blessing to the flock. Here, however, in 13, 7-9 the sudden death of the shepherd, Jahwe's shepherd, the man of his companionship, is looked upon as a calamity. Because of his death the sheep are scattered, implying that under his regime they were cared for and conserved. I would rather think here upon some leader whose fall was the occasion of lamentation,² as the pierced one of chapter 12, or, with Eichhorn,³ upon Judas Maccabeus, whose death in battle⁴ was the crowning calamity of the Maccabean crisis. The news of such a calamity could well be the occasion of this outburst of consternation

¹ We would hardly expect the epithets of 13, 7, רָעִי and גִּבֹּר עֲמִיתִי, to follow directly upon this emphatic curse of 11, 17.

² Compare נָגִיד בְּרִית, »prince of the covenant« (Dan. 11, 22), who fell before the »arms of a flood« of Antiochus Epiphanes.

³ Eichhorn unites, however, 13, 7-9 with chap. 14.

⁴ 1 Macc. 9, 18ff.

mingled with comfort.¹ The writer takes refuge in the promise of a remnant, a prophetic consolation reserved for extremities. Here the remnant shall be a third and this third refined and tested as with fire.

¹ Notice here also the total absence of the reproach which so pervades chap. 11. The sense of a common woe converts all reproach into sympathy.

XI.

CHAPTER XIV.

Chapter 14 is historically in harmony with the preceding, but its contents are to be explained rather as the product of a national condition than as the reflex of a specific event. It is an apocalypse of exaltation in the future, born of the sorrows and limitations of the present. Meditation upon the relation of Judaism to surrounding nations, and upon its mission in the future, produced an intense national self-consciousness.¹ It was a period when thought lent itself willingly to pictures of the horrors of Jahwe's punishment of world powers, in contrast to the glory of Israel when finally exalted. On the literary side, the terrible scenes of siege and devastation, during the Grecian period, furnished material for portraying the fate of the heathen, as well as

¹ The Babylonian Exile, as it advanced, fostered, especially in those intensely loyal to the national faith, a spirit, which, in the age of the Syrian-Greek persecutions, ripened into an intense hatred to »the nations«, and this in turn fostered apocalyptic pictures of the tortures to which Jahwe should subject »the nations«, in contrast with the glory which awaited Israel.

the terrible day of Jahwe which should precede the Messianic age. It was also the period of the theocracy, in the narrower sense, when the Torah was exalted and ceremonial holiness emphasised, when righteousness meant, first of all, loyalty to the national faith and observation of the ceremonial law. Instead of the prophetic message of the classic, pre-exilic, period, which demanded the turning away from sins in order to escape an impending calamity, or of the restoration period, which gave encouragement to activity in order to regain and rebuild, the prevailing motive here is that of invincible fidelity to the institutions of Judaism, in the face of oppression, of patience and endurance until the day of redemption, the day imminent and glorious for Israel. The "day of Jahwe", a day of great tribulation, stood just ahead, but it was only the prelude to an age of exaltation, when Jahwe should be the object of the homage, and Jerusalem of the pilgrimage of all nations.

Thus chapter 14 is apocalyptic. It is the author's picture of the future. It reflects an expectation. It has no word of censure, nor a command to activity, nor a precept of righteousness, but it is the unfolding of a picture of the future before the present, troubled and bitter with the instinct of vengeance against world powers. This will be clearer when we make an analysis of the contents of the chapter.

1. The day of great tribulation which was to precede the age of glory (vss. 1-5). The nations were to be assembled against Jerusalem to battle. The city should be spoiled, and the most terrible ravages and shameless violence practiced. One half of the

city should be carried away, and one half remain. Then Jahwe would appear as a great warrior against the nations. He would stand upon the Mount of Olives,¹ and the mountain should split in two, one half moving northward and one half southward, making a valley leading outward from the city. This valley, made by the cleft mountain, reaches to the city gate, making a path of escape² for that half of

¹ Here we have the first appearance of the expression »Mount of Olives« (הַר הַזֵּיתִים), the common New Test. term. 2 Sam. 15, 30 has simply »the Olives«, and Ezek. 11, 23 has »the mountain which is east of the city.«

² וְנִסְתָּם, »and ye shall flee« etc. is translated by the LXX by καὶ σταθῆσεται, »and (the cleft etc.) shall be stopped up«, reading וְנִסְתָּם from the root סָתַם, instead of the form from the root נָס. We have no further account of this earthquake than the simple mention of its occurrence in Amos 1, 1. There must have been traditions concerning it current among the later Jews, giving it a spiritual meaning. Josephus (Antiquities B. IX. c. 10) makes it occur at the moment of Uzziah's usurpation of the highpriest's office, and has also the idea of the LXX, of the way being stopped up. »In the meantime, a great earthquake shook the ground, and a rent was made in the temple, and the bright rays of the sun shone through it, and fell upon the king's face, insomuch that the leprosy seized him immediately. And before the city, at a place called *Eroge*, half the mountain broke off from the rest on the west, and rolled itself into four furlongs, and stood still at the east mountain, till the roads, as well as the kings gardens, were spoiled by the obstruction.« The *Eroge* here, as Wright (p. 478) has pointed out, after Rahmer (Monatsschrift des Judenthums, 1870), looks like a transposition of גִּיְהוֹרֵי, »the valley of my mountains«, of the Zechariah passage. Josephus has no account of the people fleeing from

the people which had not been cut off from the city. Then Jahwe should come (into the city) accompanied by "all the holy ones".

2. The transition period (vss. 6-7). A twilight period, shading from the dark day of tribulation into the light of the final age:

»And it shall be in that day,
 »There shall be no light.
 »The splendid¹ (orbs) shall be contracted.²
 »Then there shall be one day,
 »It is known to Jahwe.
 »Not day and not night,
 »But at the time of evening,
 »It shall be light.«

3. The final age (vss. 8-21).

the city from before the earthquake in the time of Uzziah. This must have been contained in the tradition in the hands of the author of Zech. 14, 5. We have no necessity for setting this prophecy before the exile on account of the expression »as ye fled before the earthquake etc.« These traditions and events in the Jewish history were always vivid, and alluded to without historical perspective. Comp. the remark of the woman at the well of Samaria (John 4, 12). »Our father Jacob, which gave us the well.«

¹ A very difficult reading, יקרֹות, pl. of יקרֹ, precious, costly, splendid. This epithet is used of the moon in Job 31, 26. LXX read as from יקרָה, and cold, *καὶ ψυχρός*.

² יקפֹּאֵן, better pointing, יקפֹּאֵן from קפֹּא = to draw in, contract. Comp. Joel 2, 10. LXX read with the Qere, יקפֹּאֵן, *καὶ πάχος*, and ice. So Vulgate: *sed frigus et gelu*; and Luther: »Kälte und Frost.« But Zanz's Bibel: »Schwere und Erstarrung«; A. E. V. »The light shall not be clear nor dark«; R. E. V. »with brightness and gloom.«

A. Some of its outward features (vss. 8-11).

- 1) Living and perennial waters should flow from Jerusalem,¹ one half toward the Dead Sea, and one half toward the Mediterranean Sea (vs. 8).
- 2) Jahwe should reign as king over the whole land² (vs. 9).
- 3) The territory of Judah should be elevated to a table-land, and Jerusalem should be situated in the middle of this high plain, with well defined walls and gates, and remain with the inhabitants without curse or danger (vss. 10-11).³

B. Relation of other nations with the Jews in the final age (vss. 12-15).

- 1) A most horrible plague should suddenly visit all the nations who had fought against Jerusalem. They should suffer a living death, their flesh decaying while they were still alive, their eyes rotting in their sockets, and their tongues in their mouths (vs. 12). This same pestilence should also attack all the animals in the camps of the enemies of Israel (vs. 15).⁴
- 2) There should be a panic and confusion among the nations, so that they should be at war among themselves (vs. 13).

¹ Comp. Ezek. 47, 1-12. Joel 4, 18.

² ארץ here can mean only »land«, as it cannot mean anything else in the following clause, vs. 10, though it can mean only »earth« in vs. 17.

³ Comp. Pss. 48. 122. 144.

⁴ V. 15 connects directly with vs. 12.

- 3) All the goods of the nations round about, all the gold, silver and clothing in immense quantities, should be collected, apparently as spoil (vs. 14).¹
- 4) Those of the nations who are left, i. e. those who have not suffered the living death for fighting against Jerusalem, should do homage to Jahwe, and should come up from year to year to Jerusalem to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles (vs. 16).²
- 5) Any nation which would not comply with this requirement should be visited with the plague of rainlessness, which meant in the east, famine, untold suffering (vs. 17). Egypt, though not

¹ The first four words of vs. 14

וְגִם יְהוּדָה תִּלָּחֵם בִּירוּשָׁלַם

are difficult in the connection. It may be that they were a marginal remark in remembrance of chap. 12, 2. The LXX has »and Judah will fight *in* Jerusalem«, while the Vulgate has, *against* Jerusalem. Versions and critics are divided as to whether it shall be *in* or *against* Jerusalem. The former is preferable. The A. E. V. has *at* (margin, *against*). The R. E. V. reverses the order and has *against* (margin, *at*).

² That the feast of Tabernacles was especially emphasised in the Maccabean period, witness such passages as 2 Macc. 1, 9. 10, 6-7. The feast of Dedication was kept as a feast of Tabernacles (comp. 1 Mac. 4, 59). For the importance given to this feast still later we have the Talmud Tract Succah, which gives the minutest directions as to the keeping of it. In the passage 2 Macc. 1, 9 the Palestinian Jews enjoin upon the Egyptian Jews the duty of keeping the feast of Tabernacles, while our prophet looks forward to the time when heathen Egypt also shall come to the Jewish feast at Jerusalem.

affected by such a plague, is especially mentioned as also to be smitten if violating the regulation (vss. 18-19).¹

C. The inner condition of Israel in the final age (vss. 20-21).

A ceremonial holiness should attach to every thing within the territory of Judah and Jerusalem. The bells² on the horses³ should have upon them קֶדֶשׁ לַיהוָה. All vessels, within the bounds of the Jewish territory should be as holy as the vessels of the altar itself (vs. 20). There would be no need of traffickers of special, clean vessels⁴ in the house of

¹ The reference to Egypt seems to be a second thought, and the plague with which it should be visited is not expressed. The masoretic text is not in order and can hardly be translated. Kimchi (M'Caul's Edition p. 187) quotes the interpretation of Jonathan, that the Nile should not rise.

² The bells, מַצְלִיֹּת, were thin round metal plates strung or fastened together like scales. When shaken, they struck each other making a tinkling sound. This was especially an Egyptian ornament for horses. See Gesenius Thesaurus p. 1168. This notice, together with the specification of Egypt in verse 18, in the manner in which it is mentionned, also the locating of the Mount of Olives (vs. 4), which would be unnecessary to an inhabitant of Jerusalem, suggests the thought that the writer had belonged to the Jewish colony in Egypt, and had those distant from Jerusalem in his mind, as among his readers.

³ This mention of the horse with such toleration is quite remarkable. The first mention of Jewish cavalry is in the account of the attack made on Cendebeus by Judas and Hyrcanus, sons of Simon, in the Maccabean period, when prosperity began to crown the Jewish state under the Hasmonean house.

⁴ Compare the New Testament picture of these traffickers Matt. 21, 12. Mk. 11, 15. Lk. 19, 45.

Jahwe. Those who should come up to sacrifice could use any vessel at hand, for it would be holy if found in Jerusalem (vs. 21).

Such is the writer's outlook. There is here a plan and method in the gradual unfolding of the events of the future. With all of its dependence upon other prophecies, this chapter is original in the order and unity of the scenes it presents — the day of Jahwe, the twilight period, the exaltation of Judaism, the horrible tortures of nations which have been hostile, the universal homage to Jahwe and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, the severe punishment of those who may refuse to make these pilgrimages, the sanctity of everything on Jewish territory, even to harness, pots and cups. We feel here that we are far away from the age of the classic prophets, and that we have reached almost the last stage of pre-Christian Jewish literature, almost the dawn of the new era; for we have here the coloring of the ideas which Jesus found dominating Jewish thought when he entered upon his ministry.¹

¹ It may be objected that we can find in the books ascribed to the pre-exilic prophets, sentiments parallel to those here put so late in Jewish literature. Whether these sentiments belong there, however, is the great question which scholarship is seeking to-day to settle. It is easier to explain how the compilers of Old Testament literature, themselves belonging to the period after the Exile, should have incorporated much post-exilic material with the earlier literature, than it is to reconcile this material with the prophetic message contained in such utterances as Is. 1. Micah 6, 1-8. Amos 5, 18-25. Jer. 7, 21f.

SUMMARY.

Summing up the results of the above inquiry, which I submit simply as a contribution to the study of this difficult theme:

I. Zech. 9-14 can be best characterized as a collection of post-Zecharianic utterances added to the original book of Zechariah. The parts are as follows: 1) 9, 1-10. 2) 9, 11-17. 3) 10. 4) 11. 5) 12. 6) 13, 1-6. 7) 13, 7-9. 8) 14.

II. Chap. 9, 1-10 had its origin at the period of the approach of Alexander the Great, it being an interpretation of the movements of the conqueror as a movement of Jahwe, with a prophecy of the humiliation of Phoenicia and Philistia, and promise of security to the Jews, who had suffered terribly under one of the last Persian Kings, Artaxerxes III, and awakening Messianic hopes of the reign of the King of Peace.

Chapter 9, 11 — chapter 14 witness to the struggle for independence, and for the maintenance of the Jewish faith at the period of the Maccabean uprising against the Greek-Syrian persecutions, and against the attempts to heathenise Judaism — a period

which fostered in the party loyal to the national faith, special zeal in uniting and saving all possible to Judaism, begetting also, in reaction against the looseness of the times, a strictness of adherence to religious forms, and, in the midst of the troubles and limitations of the present, apocalyptic visions of the exaltation of Israel over the hated nations, when an impending catastrophe should be overpast.

III. As to the unity existing between these utterances, there is not sufficient data upon which to found a positive objection against their issuing from a single hand (except, as we have seen, in the case of 9, 1-10). At the same time each piece is a unit in itself, with its own occasion and motive. The nearest determination at which criticism will probably arrive in regard to these separate pieces contained in chap. 9, 11 — chap. 14, is that while they are historically in harmony, i. e. are the product of the same period, their lack of external unity on the one hand, and of internal differences on the other, is sufficient to cause the question of unity or plurality of authorship to remain an open one.



